

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXVIII, 3.

WHOLE NO. III.

## I.—THE STELE INSCRIPTION IN THE ROMAN FORUM.

### I.

Pais, in his recent work, *Ancient Legends of Roman History*, p. 280, says, "It is not necessary to report here all the worthless literature,<sup>1</sup> that has sprung up around this remarkable monument. The *cippus* was edited for the first time in the *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1899. The official interpretation there presented by L. Ceci is pitiful". Otto<sup>2</sup> at the end of his review says, "Das Resultat unserer Betrachtung ist, wie ja vorauszusehen war, kein erfreuliches. Aber vielleicht gelingt es ihr das unfruchtbare Grübeln von diesem elenden Bruchstücke abzuleiten". More recently Skutsch<sup>3</sup> says in regard to the inscription, "Die Flut von Literatur . . . hat abgibt und was vereinzelt nachkommt wird für einige Chroniken künftig kaum mehr Stoff bieten". Such

<sup>1</sup> Useful summaries of the literature, not all of it worthless, as even Pais admits, are given by Tropea (*Rivista di Storia Antica* IV 469-509, V 105-136, 301-355, VI 157-184, VII 425-427, VIII 529-533). See also Skutsch (*Vollmüller Jahresb. f. Roman. Phil.* VI I, 453-459), Otto (*ALL.* XI 431-437, XII 102-113), I. F., *Anzeiger* XII 260-262, XV 94 f., Platner (*TAPA.* 32, XIV ff. with facsimiles), Baddeley translating Boni (*Archaeologia* 57, 175-184 with facsimiles), Clark (*Proceedings, London Society of Antiquaries*, 18, 392-409). Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* II, n. 4913, gives the inscription with brief comments. Besides examining the inscription *in situ*, I have had access to a cast in the Harvard Classical Museum, from which I have made careful measurements of each letter. To these I have, for brevity's sake, not made reference in this article. As there is no way of determining the length of each line, and as in some lines the letters are much more crowded together than in others, and some letters take much more space than others, it is certain that the lines did not have a uniform number of letters.

<sup>2</sup> *ALL.* XII 113.

<sup>3</sup> *Vollmüller, Jahresb.* VIII 57, 1906.

words might well deter a modest scholar, not eager for the fate of Marsyas, from attempting to solve the apparently insoluble. Remembering, however, Ritschl's<sup>1</sup> motto, "Nil sine magno—nil tam difficilest", one may perhaps be warranted in making a fresh attempt based mainly upon a comparison with Greek, Latin, and Umbrian inscriptions which have to do with ritual. For however wrong Ceci may have been in his interpretation, I believe he was right in regarding the monument as of a sacrificial character. He refers to Dionysius II 73 and Livy I 20, "Pontificem deinde . . . ex patribus legit (Numa) eique sacra omnia exscripta exsignataque attribuit, quibus hostiis, quibus diebus, ad quae templa sacra fierent, atque unde in eos sumptus pecunia erogaretur". I would add Fronto (Naber, p. 226), "Numa senex sanctissimus nonne inter liba et decimas profanandas et suovetaurilia mactanda aetatem egit, epulorum (*epulonum*, Niebuhr) dictator, cenarum libator, feriarum promulgator?" Compare Cicero, de Rep. II 26 f. While we have in Latin outside of the Acts of the Arval Brethren few inscriptions dealing with ritual, in Greek such inscriptions are very numerous and are now conveniently assembled in Prott-Ziehen's *Leges Graecorum Sacrae* (I 1896, II 1, 1906; a third part is still to appear). The age of the inscription I shall not now discuss. It has been variously estimated from the seventh century down to the fourth. Thurneysen<sup>2</sup> would assign it to the regal period and make *regei Lo(ucioi)* refer to Tarquinius Superbus. Pais assigns it to a much later date. Nor are scholars agreed as to whether the inscription forms one continuous whole. Ludwig<sup>3</sup> went so far as to say, "Es scheint dass jede der vier seiten ihren eigenen text hatte, ob von der dritten zur vierten fläche der context hinübergrif ist unsicher. Einen gemeinsamen inhalt hatten die vier seiten nicht."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Opusc. V 30.

<sup>2</sup>I use in this article the abbreviation ZP. Von Prott died before the appearance of Vol. II.

<sup>3</sup>Rhein. Mus. 56, 164.

<sup>4</sup>Die Stele auf dem Forum Romanum, Prague, 1901, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup>Roberts and Gardner (Introduction to Greek Epigraphy, p. 379, n. 133) say of a slab of Pentelic marble found in the Piraeus, "The stone is inscribed on (A) the front, (B) the left side, (C) the upper surface, (D) the back. The left side (B) is thought by Dragatsis to be a later addition. But Koehler remarks that A 11 sqq. appear to be by a different hand from that which wrote 1-10, and yet they must have been inscribed at nearly the same time". Compare ZP.

Hülsen<sup>1</sup> after commenting on differences in the letters A and M and on the interpunctuation says, "Wir hätten demnach drei Inschriften auf den vier Hauptseiten des cippus". Boni<sup>2</sup> (tr. Baddeley) says, "Two distinct hands may be detected in the inscription. It is in fact evident that the letters M and B (*sic* = A?) in certain lines are superior to the same letters in others. Comparetti<sup>3</sup> says, "Un segno a cui per ultimo dobbiamo rivolgere l'attenzione è quella linea, certamente non casuale, che si vede tirata su parte della riga 10<sup>a</sup>. Va osservato che essa si trova dopo quelle due linee di scrittura ove questa si vede capovolta rispetto a tutte le altre linee anteriori e posteriori (eccetto quella dello spigolo, ossia la 16<sup>a</sup>). Volendo congetturare sul suo ufficio, parebbe che essa segnasse il principio di una nuova parte nel testo dell' epigrafe". Hülsen and Skutsch, following Thurneysen's<sup>4</sup> suggestion, would read lines 12-15 in the order 15, 14, 13, 12, thus disposing of the mysterious word *havelod*. This arrangement, despite their ingenious argumentation, seems to me in itself improbable, and must be abandoned, if we can so supplement the lines taken in their natural order, as to give an interpretation, which shall commend itself as plausible. This I hope to do. I regard lines 10-16, i. e. including the line upon the bevelled edge, as one continuous inscription, which I shall take up first before considering lines 1-9. Passing over for the moment the letters IOD, the first visible in line 10, I take up the first two (three) words preserved, IO : VXMENTA : KAPIA. Neglecting the punctuation,<sup>5</sup> Ceci arbitrarily reads *ioux menta* with an impossible interpretation. Other scholars take *iouxmenta* = *iumenta*. Buecheler<sup>6</sup> thinks *kapia* is for *kapiad*. Comparetti interprets *kapia dota* most improbably as *capistro ducta*. Thurneysen<sup>7</sup> proposes to interpret *iumenta Gabia* (= *Gabina*), rightly rejected as improbable by Skutsch. Thurneysen<sup>8</sup> says, "*Iouxmenta kapia* einfach als 'erbeutete Zug-

II, n. 144, a stele from Cos inscribed on four sides of which Paton says, "The letters of cols. *a* and *b* are similar, those of *a* rather larger. The letters of cols. *c* and *d* are similar in size and shape but slightly later than those of cols. *a* and *b*".

<sup>1</sup> Beitrage zur Alten Geschichte II 232.

<sup>2</sup> Archaeologia 57, 184.

<sup>3</sup> Iscrizione archaica del foro Romano, p. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Rhein. Mus. 55, 484.

<sup>5</sup> In regard to the interpuncts before VXMENTA Comparetti (p. 9) says, "Punti deboli che in parte si ravvisano anche nella fotografia".

<sup>6</sup> Rhein. Mus. 60, 518.

<sup>7</sup> Rhein. Mus. 56, 164.

<sup>8</sup> Rhein. Mus. 56, 163.

thiere' zu fassen, geht wohl nicht an, da von unzusammengesetzten Verbal-stämmen (*cap-ere*) Adjectiva auf *-ius* nicht abgeleitet zu werden pflegen". This contention can, I think, be disproved. While it is true that most adjectives of this class appear in compounds,<sup>1</sup> there seems to be no good reason for asserting that in an earlier period of Latin such adjectives were not formed quite freely from simple verbs. In Greek also we have comparatively few such adjectives. Hirt<sup>2</sup> gives as examples *ἄγιος*, *στύγιος*, *σπάγιον*, *μυρία*, *πενία*, comparing in Latin only substantives *studium*, *invidia*, *praesidium*. I would cite *filius*, *filia*, proved to be a verbal adjective, and not only Latin but Italic, by Umbrian *feliuf*,<sup>3</sup> *fluviuf*, *fluvia*,<sup>4</sup> *pluviuf*, *pluvia*, *gumia*, Umb. *gomia* = *gravidas*,<sup>5</sup> *socius*, *genius*,<sup>6</sup> (*Primigenia*), *Lubia*,<sup>7</sup> and *loiquios* in this inscription.<sup>8</sup> Of compound adjectives there are three especially worthy of note, as being connected with sacrifice,<sup>9</sup> *praemetium*, *eximius*, *effugia*. Of *praemetium* Paulus, p. 465, under *sacrima*, says, "sicut *praemetium* de spicis, quas primum messuissent, sacrificabant Cereri". Paulus, p. 57, says, "*Eximium* inde dici coeptum, quod in sacrificiis optimum pecus e grege *eximebatur*". Compare Donatus, Hec. 66. More important still Macrobius S. 3, 5, 6, *Eximii* quoque in sacrificiis vocabulum non poeticum *ἐπιθερον* sed sacerdotale nomen est. Veranius enim in Pontificalibus Quaestionibus docet, "*eximias* dictas hostias, quae ad sacrificium destinatae *eximantur* e grege, vel quod *eximia* specie quasi offerendae numinibus elegantur, hinc ait 'quattuor *eximios* praestanti corpore tauros'" (Verg. G. 4, 538). Compare Livy 1, 7, 12, bove *eximia* capta (= KAPIA) de grege; 1, 7, 5; 7, 37, 1 and 5. *Eximius* is also glossed *ἱεραπερός*.

<sup>1</sup> Of these Stolz (Hist. Gram. 457) says, "In der älteren Latinität dürften diese Bildungen häufiger gewesen sein". Probably some of them still await detection. For *prandium* = *prām-ediom*, cf. Walde, Et. Wb. s. v. For *novicius* = *novo-veiq-ijos* (?) 'new-conquered', cf. Niedermann, I. F. XIX, Anzeiger 33.

<sup>2</sup> Handbuch der Gr. Laut und Formenlehre 254; cf. I. F. XVIII 382; K. Z. 36, 180.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Walde, Et. Wb.; Buecheler, Rhein. Mus. 39, 411. Hirt, Die Indogermanen II 608, cites *bilia* = *filia* from a Messapian inscription.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Wölfflin, ALL. VII 588.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Buecheler, Rhein. Mus. 37, 522.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Paulus 67, and Otto, Philologus 64, 179. <sup>7</sup> Cf. Usener, Götternamen 8.

<sup>8</sup> To these may be added *caviae* whence *cavia res*, see Walde under *cauda*, *favius* in glosses, *pius*? (Etymology uncertain), and *gubernius*; cf. ALL. VII 588. Others more doubtful, as *hostia*, *Aius*, *vatiuf*, I omit.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *ἄγιος* = Skt. *yajyas*, *σπάγιον*, and *proscia*, *proscium*.



Lucan 1, 609, has '*electa cervice marem*'. *Effugia*<sup>1</sup> only occurs in Servius A. II 408, "hostia quae ad aras adducta est immolanda, si casu *effugeret*, '*effugia*' vocari veteri more solet". Compare Servius, A. II 104, Val. Max. I 6, 7; Cato, Origines II 27. Although the gloss *Fugeus et Sagaris nomen servorum* (Corp. Gl. V 203, 19) has undoubtedly been correctly emended by Buecheler to *Phegeus*, etc. (Verg. A. 5, 263), I believe that in early Latin *fugia* could have been used for *effugia*. Pauli (Altitalische Forschungen III 26) gives from an inscription of the Veneti *bhuxia* = *Fugia* as a name derived from *fugio*<sup>2</sup>. *Kapia* then may have the meaning of *taken* (*captured*) or *selected*. Its passage from one meaning to the other may be illustrated from Tac. Ann. II 88, *capiendam* virginem in locum Occiae, where the Tacitus Lexicon gives to *capere* the meaning *deligere*,<sup>3</sup> while Gellius, I 12, explains its original use "veluti bello *capta* abducitur". Pais<sup>4</sup> then may be right and wrong in comparing *kapia* with Umbrian *hatuto*, i. e. the original meaning may have been changed through a change of custom. I prefer to take *kapia* (comparing *eximius* and Livy 1, 7, 12 already cited) in

<sup>1</sup> Compare however the gloss (Goetz, Corp. Gl. VI, 376) *Effugium* qui de bello ad alteram partem *transfugit*.

<sup>2</sup> But see Schulze, zur Geschichte Lateinischer Eigennamen, p. 46, who compares *vhouxontah*, *vhouxontna*, etc., with *Feucontis* CIL. III 10722, and thinks the name Illyrian. Schwab, Nomina propria Latina, p. 693, cites *Fugantius* from CIL. V 8986 a, and explains '*qui fugat hostes*'.

<sup>3</sup> Nonius, 253 M., explains *capere* by *eligere*, citing Ter. Hec. 537 and Verg. G. II 230. Plautus uses *capere* in this sense. See Lodge's Lexicon. For ἀπέρω = *alperō* in the sense of 'catch' and 'choose' see Buck, Class. Phil. 2. 273.

<sup>4</sup> Pais (Ancient Legends, p. 16 f.) says, "We know that at Rome as in Greece, it was the custom to sacrifice to the gods animals still untamed by the yoke. The exceptions that can be noted in Thebes, Rhodes, and Rome itself, do not authorize us to believe (as has been done) that in these cases reference was made to sacrifices. But even if this were so, we would find in the *tabulae* from Iguvium a rite which would explain the words *iouxmenta capia*. One might indeed believe that the Forum inscription alludes to some ceremony similar to that of the Umbrian city,—in which oxen and cows were pursued as enemies which the citizens endeavored to *capere*. With this ceremony of the Iguvini we might compare the Roman festivals of the Poplifugium and of the Vitulatio (July 5th). Referring to this (p. 280, n. 4) he says, "See Tab. Iguv. VII, A. 40 (= 52), I. B. 40, *postquam tertium populum lustraverit, iuvencam opimam fugato super comitio flamen, legati duas fuganto intra forum seminarium capiunto*. Compare Buecheler, Umbrica, p. 115. To the examples cited by Buecheler there can be added, I believe, the somewhat different ceremony performed at Hermione, in regard to the oxen sacrificed to *Ceres Chthonia*, Paus. II 35, 7."

the sense of *selected*,<sup>1</sup> on account of a remarkable parallel in the sacrificial Calendar of Cos. In this inscription, first published by Hicks<sup>2</sup>, the largest fragment forms part of the calendar for the month Batromios, extending from the 19th to the 25th day. Paton<sup>3</sup> says, "The 19th day is imperfect; the portion preserved (lines 1-47) deals almost entirely with the ceremonies to be observed on the vigil of the sacrifice to Zeus Polieus, the selection of the ox,<sup>4</sup> etc. On the 20th day (lines 47-58) the selected ox is sacrificed to Zeus Polieus, and a ewe to Athene Polias". In the account of the ceremonies of the 19th day, we find the words<sup>5</sup> τὸν δὲ κριθέντα (supply βοῦν) τῷ Ζηνὶ κίρυκες ἄγοντι εἰς ἀγοράν. The account of the twentieth day<sup>6</sup> begins with the words: ἱκάδι. βοῦς ὁ κριθεῖς<sup>7</sup> θύεται Ζηνὶ Πολιῇ. In PZ. I, n. 6, l. 10, we have Ζηνὶ Μαχανῇ βοῦς κρίνεται . . . καθάπερ τοῦ Βατρομίου τῷ Ζηνὶ τῷ Πολιῇ κρίνεται. Resting on these parallels I would interpret IO : VXMENTA : KAPIA as 'the oxen selected for Juppiter'.

IO<sup>8</sup> may be an abbreviation for IOVEI, or it is possible that

<sup>1</sup> Cicero uses *deligere hostiam*, De Div. I 118, II 35 and 36. In Umbrian *upetu* = *optato* is used five times of victims. Compare Festus 210, *Optatam* hostiam, alii optimam appellant eam, quam Aedilis tribus constitutis hostiis optat, quam immolari velit.

<sup>2</sup> Journal of Hellenic Studies IX (1888) 323-337. Cf. Paton and Hicks, The Inscriptions of Cos (1891), p. 77 ff.; PZ. I, n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Inscriptions of Cos, p. 83.

<sup>4</sup> Paton's description of the selection of the ox is too long to quote in full. I quote parts. "Twenty-seven oxen were first selected, nine from each tribe then each of the three tribes separately drove to the ἀγορά three of their selected oxen, the Pamphyli having precedence. When they had all reached the ἀγορά, the three lots of oxen, were combined into one. The priest of Zeus and the ἱεροποιοί sat at a table in, or near the ἀγορά, and to this table the three tribes . . . drove up the nine oxen in sets of three, beginning with the finest, in order that the ox for sacrifice might be there selected by some special test. . . . If none of the nine oxen, which in human judgment were the best, were selected, then each tribe drove down three others to the ἀγορά and the process was repeated until the whole twenty-seven were exhausted, etc."

<sup>5</sup> PZ. I, n. 5, l. 23.

<sup>6</sup> PZ. I. 47.

<sup>7</sup> κρίνω (ἐπικρίνω) occurs repeatedly in PZ. I, n. 5 and n. 6, and II, n. 88.

<sup>8</sup> For this abbreviation *Iovesat* in the Duenos inscription would offer a parallel if we are willing to divide with Deecke and Conway (A. J. P. X 451) *Io Vei Sat*. I do not accept *iovesat* = *iurat*, although correct morphologically, nor do I cling to the explanation proposed by me in Harvard Studies in Classical Philology XI 165. In many respects the interpretation first proposed by Buecheler (Rhein. Mus. 36, 235) still seems to me the most satisfactory, and with it *Io Vei Sat*, would not be inconsistent. *Iovei* itself is reduced to the

the graver had before him IOVEIVXMENTA, and, after writing the first V, by an oversight wrote XMENTA, which follows the second V, and then discovering his mistake, did the best he could by putting points (Comparetti's '*punti deboli*') between O and V. We have no right to ignore this interpunctuation, which, if the word stood for *iouxmenta*, would not even be syllabic (see below). *Iumentum* is derived by Walde<sup>1</sup> from *iouxmentum* despite the vigorous protest of Mommsen<sup>2</sup> who insisted on the derivation from *iuvare*. Phonetically I see no reason against equating *iouxmenta* with *iumenta*, and I myself so explained it until I met with the Cos inscription. But not to mention the fact that the Romans at least usually sacrificed *hostiae iniuges* (cf. Pais as cited above and Macrobius S. 3, 5, 5), *iumenta* is too vague a term for a sacrificial inscription,<sup>3</sup> for it is used of horses and other animals as well as oxen, and from it comes the fr. *iument*.<sup>4</sup> I would connect *uxmentum* with the same root seen in Sanskrit *ukṣán*, Av. *uxšan*, Goth. *auhsa*, O. H. G. *ohso*, N. H. G. *ochse*, Cym. *yeh*, English *ox*,<sup>5</sup> and perhaps in Lat. *uxor*.

form *Iue* (Dessau 2991) and there would be no danger of a Roman misunderstanding IO in such an inscription. That we should necessarily have *Diouei*, as is often asserted, in so early an inscription, I do not believe. The dialectic forms make against the assumption, cf. Walde s. v. *Iuno* has nothing to do with *Iuppiter*, but may have helped to establish early the spelling with *I*. *Diuturna* may not be the earlier spelling of *Iuturna*, see Walde.

<sup>1</sup> Compare also Solmsen, Rhein. Mus. 56, 499, and Buecheler, Rhein. Mus. 60, 318.

<sup>2</sup> Hermes 38, 115.

<sup>3</sup> *Armenta* is used by Valerius Flaccus, IV 337; Statius, Theb. 6, 220; 8, 340; but this proves nothing for inscriptions.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Mommsen l. c. and ALL. VII 321 and 591.

<sup>5</sup> The absence of any Greek cognate in this list is surprising. Scholars have not been wanting to connect *μόςχος* (see Pott, K. Z. 26, 188). The only way in which this seems to me possible, is to suppose that in a pre-Hellenic period (cf. Hermann, K. Z. 41, 18)\* τὸν \*μόσχομ was wrongly divided τὸ μόσχομ. A similar phenomenon has given rise to many words in English; cf. *newt* from *an ewt*, *a nye* for *an eye*, M. E.; *a nox* for *an ox*, M. E.; *nickname*; conversely *adder*, *apron* have lost an initial *n*. Many examples are given by Scott, TAPA. XXIII, 179-305. I am aware that *μόςχος* is usually equated with Lit. *mázgas* (cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb.<sup>2</sup> and Osthoff, I. F. VIII 18). Scheftelowitz (BB. 28, 300) denies any connection between Arm. *mozi* 'calf' and *μόςχος* (cf. I. F. XIV 56). Patrubány, I. F. XIII 124, attempts to connect Arm. *ezn* = Ox, with Gr. *δσχος* 'young branch'. As *μόςχος* = both *branch* and *calf*, so perhaps at one time *δσχος*, and the *δσχοφόροι* may originally have carried oxen or images of oxen. It is noteworthy that but for Quintilian 8, 2, 13 we should not know that *taurus* also meant *radix arboris*.

Sanskrit scholars are not agreed as to the derivation of *ukṣān*. Uhlenbeck<sup>1</sup> says "Idg \**uksen*—darf vielleicht zu *ukṣāti*<sup>2</sup> (besprengt) oder zu *ikṣati* (wächst) gestellt werden." Hirt<sup>3</sup> doubts the first derivation, saying, "Zunächst kann ich das verbum *ukṣ* nicht in der Bedeutung 'besamen' belegen, und dann muss man gegen alle diese etymologischen Versuche mistrauisch sein, die ein Wort aus dem gleichzeitigen Sprachstoff erklären wollen". For the many derivations proposed for *uxor* I refer to Walde. Froehde<sup>4</sup> and Wiedemann<sup>5</sup> connect it with *augeo* (Skt. *ikṣati*), "herangewachsenes mannbares Mädchen". Walde seems to prefer to connect it with *veho* (vgl. Skt. *vadhūś* Braut.), and I am informed by Sanskrit specialists that there is no insuperable objection to connecting Skt. *ukṣān* with the root *vah*<sup>6</sup>. Taking either derivation then, *uxor* and *uxmentum* may contain the same root. Idg \**uksen*<sup>7</sup> would then in Latin, under the influence of other nouns in *-men*, *-mentum*, (cf. *armentum*) become *uxmentum*.<sup>8</sup> *Uxmentum* would naturally become *umentum*, and after the introduction of dialectal *bos*, being no longer needed, through confusion with *iumentum*<sup>9</sup> (however derived) might

<sup>1</sup> Kurzgefasstes Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Altindischen Sprache.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Walde, Et. Wb., under *avidus*, and Fick II<sup>4</sup> 266 f. <sup>3</sup> Cf. I. F. VII 112.

<sup>4</sup> BB. XIV 95. <sup>5</sup> BB. XXVII 215. See also Wood (I. F. XVIII 21).

<sup>6</sup> Monier Williams in his Dictionary says that *ukṣān* is used of ox or bull (especially as drawing the chariot of Ushas, or dawn) and under the root *vah* he gives *vahata* and *vahati* = ox and *vahatu* = ox and also bridal. Compare Lat. *ducere uxorem* and Festus 561, *Veterinam bestiam iumentum* Cato appellavit a *vehendo* (a derivation which Walde does not accept).

<sup>7</sup> Can \**uxen* be contained in the name of the town in Calabria *Uzentum*? (Nisser, Ital. Landeskunde II 885); cf. CIL. IX, p. 3. Ptol. III 1, 67 gives *Ὀῤῥεντρον*; Tab. Peut., *Usintum*, cf. Paelig. *usur* = *uxor*. Compare *Italia* > *vitulus* (? see Walde) and the names *Bovillae*, *Bovianum*, etc. The prevalence of similar names in this region, *Tarentum*, *Hydruntum*, *Sipontum*, etc. (Hirt, Indogermanen II, p. 607) probably makes against this.

<sup>8</sup> It has not seemed to me necessary to give other examples of suffix-adaptation. Recently Thurneysen, I. F. XXI 175, has shown how *bitumen* owes its suffix to *alumen*. A modern English example which I have not seen in print is *motorneer* (formed after *engi-neer*), which I myself saw in New Haven shortly after the introduction of electric cars,—“Don't speak to the *motorneer*”. *Fundus* and *πυθμήν* have the same root but are as unlike as \**δοσχος* and \**uxmen*. Brugmann (ALL. 15. 1 ff.) has shown how *senex* and *iuvenis* have influenced each other.

<sup>9</sup> A possibility which has occurred to me, only to be rejected, is that *iumentum* is derived from *umentum*, *u* becoming *iu* as in Oscan, under certain conditions (Buck, Gram. Osc. and Umb., p. 40). Birt (Rhein. Mus. 52, Ergänzungs-

drop out of use. After *uxmenta* come the letters DOTAV. Comparetti interprets *dota* as *ducta*, Ceci as *dona*, while Thurneysen takes *dotau-* as a preterite from *dotare*. This seems to me improbable both from the sense and from the fact that the verb *dotare* is not ante-Augustan. *Dotatus*, which is Plautine, of course does not imply a verb *dotare* any more than *togatus* implies a verb *togare*. I would explain DOTA as the graver's mistake for DATOD, the last four letters being read in the reverse order. They may have stood in his copy at the end of a line, and by an error not difficult to explain psychologically, he anticipated the boustrophedon order.<sup>1</sup>

For *dare* used in connection with sacrifice it is hardly necessary to give examples. Brissonius, in his valuable work "De Formulæ et Sollemnibus Populi Romani verbis" (Mainz 1649, p. 24 ff.), has collected examples which might be greatly increased.<sup>2</sup> It is worth while to notice that in Umbrian *dirstu* (*tertu, ditu, titu, tetu*) = *datod* (cf. Brugmann, I. F. XVIII 532) is regularly used as in Ig. Tab. VI b, 38, *proseseto erus dirstu* = *prosectorum magmentum dato*. Some, however, may prefer to take *dotau*<sup>3</sup> as an old im-

---

heft, p. 176) has collected many examples of *iu* and *ui* for *u* from MSS, but they seem to have little weight. In English words like *union* the *y* is regularly pronounced, but not written. Etruscan *Uni* = *Iuno* (Otto, Philologus 64, 175) shows the opposite tendency but we do not know how it was pronounced. It is of course conceivable that *viginti umentia* should be pronounced *vigint(i) iumentia*, just as in Albanian *iu* = *u* as in *hani ju* = 'ihr esst' (cf. Zeit. für Kelt. Phil. II 190). *Iumentum* then by popular etymology connecting it with *iungo* or *iuvo* might get its wider meaning. For *u* becoming *iu* in some dialects of South Italy see Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. I 75.

<sup>1</sup>The letters ATO do not differ much in whatever direction written, and it is possible that in the graver's copy, for lack of room, ATOD was written under the line and nearly on a level with the following line, which takes the opposite direction, the first D of DATOD being perhaps illegible. One may compare CIL. XIV 2892 (Conway, It. Dialects, p. 314), an old inscription from Praeneste *l gemenio l f pel t d / hercole dono dat*. The *l* of *pel* is followed by a slanting stroke to connect it with the two following letters *t d* (or *e*), which are put vertically beneath it.

<sup>2</sup>From Inscriptions compare CIL. IX 5845, *daretur hostia*; from glosses under *magmentum* (C. Gl. VI 669), *quicquid dis datur*. Cf. Festus 380, in sacrificiis publicis cum puls fabata *dis datur*, nominatur refriva. For the form *datod* compare the well-known inscription from Spoletium (Dessau 4911), *Iovi bovid piaculum datod*—modernized in the Lex Regia, Festus, p. 212, cuius auspicio capta, dis piaculum *dato*. Compare Macrobi. S. I, 16, 10, porco piaculum *dare*.

<sup>3</sup>Other possibilities which have occurred to me only to be rejected are: 1. *au* = the *au-* in *aufero* (cf. Thurneysen, ALL. 13, 8), here a separable particle



perative without explanation like Goth. *at-steigadau* = *καταβάτω* (cf. Brugmann, Grundriss II<sup>1</sup> 1329, BB 26, 153), comparing Gr. *δότης*, Lat. *sacerdos* and *cēdo* (but see Walde, Et. Wb., p. 700).

The next line (12), the first on the fourth side, which is written in the same direction, right to left, as the previous line, begins with M. Before considering the word or words to be supplied between V and M, I wish to take up the following letters: I : TE : RI : T (?), out of which Thurneysen makes a verb *iterit* = *iterat*. I regard I as standing for IOVEI abbreviated here, because the word had occurred just before.<sup>1</sup> I propose to read TERITOREI = *Territori*. Having insisted upon the interpunctuation between IO and VXMENTA, I may seem inconsistent in ignoring it here.<sup>2</sup> But here the interpunctuation is strictly syllabic,<sup>3</sup> and moreover the graver is probably not the same as on the previous side. Witness the different form of the E's.

Dennison, who has considered most carefully the subject of syllabification in Latin inscriptions, says<sup>4</sup> of inscriptions dividing words into syllables by interpunctuation that they are not numerous, about 106 having been found in Italy. "In some cases nearly every word in the inscription is divided into its syllables

and post-positive, as *i prae* for *praei*, and *dot* is a subjunctive form = Gk. *δῶ*. *Dotau* would then have the force of Lat. *reddere*, Gk. *ἀποδιδόναι*, often used in Gk. Inscriptions. Cf. Dessau 3237, a bilingual inscription in which *ἀπεδω κε* translates *dedit*, and Dionysius, VI 95, *θυσίας ἀποδοῦναι τοῖς θεοῖς*. 2. *dot* is subjunctive, and *au* the first syllable of *aurata*, often used of victims in the Acts of the Arval Brethren (cf. Thesaurus s. v.), or of *augur* (cf. Serv. A. 3, 265, *sacrificium augurale*). The absence of punctuation is against this. 3. *dota* is a mistake for *datod*, V = *quinque* just as in the Ludi Saec. insc. and in the Acts of the Arval Brethren numerals are used with victims. Five is not a usual number for victims, but compare *quinquaginta* = *lustrare*, *lustrum*, a period of five years, and see Walde under *pontifex*. See also Livy 21, 62, 9, *genio maiores hostiae caesae quinque*; Cic., de Rep. 2, 2, 6, *sacris e principum numero pontifices quinque praefecit*.

<sup>1</sup> A similar explanation would apply here as in the case of IO above, i. e. the graver's eye passed from the first to the last I of IOVEI and he left out the intervening letters. This however seems to me improbable.

<sup>2</sup> The interpuncts can be clearly seen in Comparetti's facsimile.

<sup>3</sup> Buecheler (Rhein. Mus. 55, 2), speaking of the Etruscan inscription found at Capua, says, "Offenbar dient die Interpunction dazu wie auch bei der *Ioux-menta*-inschrift sich zeigt, nicht nur Wörter zu trennen sondern auch Silben und die Elemente des Wortes".

<sup>4</sup> Classical Philology I 64.

by interpuncts as in CIL. VI 15546, IX 4028, but more often this mode of division is employed only in a few words, as in XIV 2202, or in one word merely, as in V 5021". In Ephemeris Epig. II, n. 678, from Pannonia (not included by Dennison in his investigation), HER·CVLI is written with a point after the first syllable, the only example of such division in the inscription. Juppiter Territor is known to us only from one inscription found near Tivoli now in the Museo delle Terme, Rome (Dessau 3028 = CIL. XIV 3559):

SANCTO IOVI TERRITORI SACRVM

A rubbing of this inscription in my possession shows that it is not early, as the case forms themselves declare. The lettering is of a good period. Fortunately we can support the evidence of the inscription by a passage from Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In speaking of the first secession of the plebs, commonly assigned to 494 B. C., but utterly discredited now by Pais<sup>1</sup> and other modern historians, Dionysius says (VI 90), 'Επειδὴ ταῦτ' ἐψηφίσαντο, βωμὸν κατεσκεύασαν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκρωρείας, ἐν ᾗ κατεστρατοπέδευσαν, ὃν ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ σχόντος αὐτοὺς τότε δείματος ὠνόμασαν, ὡς ἡ πάτριος αὐτῶν σημαίνει γλῶσσα, Διὸς Δειματίου.<sup>2</sup> ᾧ θυσίας ἐπιτελέσαντες καὶ τὸν ὑποδεξάμενον αὐτοὺς τόπον ἱερὸν ἀνέντες, κατήσαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἅμα τοῖς πρέσβεσιν. ἀποδόντες δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει θεοῖς χαριστήρια<sup>3</sup> etc. The Didot ed. gives *Pavoni* as a translation of Δειματίου, but Carter<sup>4</sup> rightly compares *Juppiter Territor*.<sup>5</sup> With this deity I compare *Jovia Torra* (*Tursa*) in the Iguvine Tables. *Tursa*<sup>6</sup> occurs ten times in these Tables, twice without an epithet, four times as *Tursa Šerfia* (*Cerria*), and four times with *Jovia*. In VII a, 49, *Tursa Jovia* is invoked and the words *tursitu*, *tremitu* = *terreto*, *tremefacito*, are used. *Tursa*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ed. Meyer, *Hermes* 30, 18; Merlin, *L'Aventin dans l'Antiquité* (1906), p. 266.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Festus, p. 466, *Sacer mons appellatur trans Anienem, paullo ultra tertium miliarium: quod eum Plebes, cum secessisset a patribus, creatis TR. Plebis, qui sibi essent auxilio, discedentes Iovi consecraverunt; Paulus, p. 467, quia Iovi fuerat consecratus.*

<sup>3</sup> This word suggested to me *Vitulatio*. See below, p. 263.

<sup>4</sup> *De Deorum cognominibus*, p. 57.

<sup>5</sup> The scholiasts on Hor. C. I, 2, *terrui urbem, terrui gentis*, do not mention *Juppiter Territor*, and probably Horace had more in mind *Juppiter Fulgur, Fulminans* (cf. C. 3, 3, 6).

<sup>6</sup> Bréal (*Les tables Eugubines* 304 and 388) is inclined to equate *tursa* with *terra*, but Buecheler, Conway and Buck connect it with *terreo*; v. *Planta* I, 487, leaves the choice open.

is evidently from the same root seen in *tursitu*—a causative verb for which the Latin has *terrere* instead of *torrere* (see Walde). In a passage (I b, 40 ff.), which has to do with the lustration of the people and which Buck compares with Dion. Hal. IV 22, we have these words, "Pustertiu pane puplu aterafust, iveka perakre *tusetu* super kumne ařfertur, prinuvatu tuf *tusetutu*, hutra furu sehmeniar *hatutu*. Eaf iveka tre Akeřunie fetu *Tuse Iuvie*".<sup>1</sup> The later version (VII a, 51 ff.) varies somewhat and should be compared with the account cited above (p. 254, n. 4), concerning the selection of the ox in the Cos Calendar. The Umbrian probably represents the earlier custom of the two, but preserved later. "Enom iuvenga peracrio *tursituto*, porse perca arsmatia habiest et prinuatur. Hondra furo sehemeniar *hatuto totar pisi heriest*. Pafe trif promom haburent, eaf Acersoniem fetu *Turse Iovie*".<sup>2</sup> Buck (grammar, p. 308) remarks on the difference between the two versions, "In the older version three heifers are let loose, one by the flamen, two by the assistants, and then caught and sacrificed. In VII more than three (apparently twelve, cf. VII b) are let loose and the first three caught are sacrificed". As a parallel to *Iovei* in l. 10 of the Stele without an epithet followed in l. 12 by *Iovei Teritorei* we may compare VII a, 46, *Tursar*, followed in 47 by *Tursa Iovia*, just as in the Cos Calendar τῶι Ζητὶ is named on the 19th day, and Ζητὶ Πολιτῆι on the 20th.

The connection between *fright* and *flight* is obvious. Φέβομαι,<sup>3</sup> which Hirt connects with Φεύγω, means 'to be put to flight', 'to flee affrighted'.<sup>4</sup> Φόβος in Homer, 'flight', is in later Greek 'fear' and is personified as a deity.<sup>5</sup> Homer couples φύζα with φόβος (Il. 9, 2). Menandros couples φυγή with φόβος (Spengel, Rhet. Graeci 3, 341), just as in the old formula preserved by Macrobius (S. III 9, 10)

<sup>1</sup> Buck translates "Postquam tertium populum lustraverit, iuvencam opimam *fugato* super comitio flamen, legati duas *fuganto*, infra forum seminarium *capiunto*. Eas iuvenas tris Acedoniae facito *Torrae Joviae*".

<sup>2</sup> Buck translates "Tum iuvenas ex opimis *fuganto*, qui virgam ritalem habebit et legati. Infra forum seminarium *capiunto civitatis quisquis volet*. Quas tris primum ceperint, eas in Acedonia facito *Torrae Joviae*".

<sup>3</sup> Cf. τρέω—Hesych., ἐτερσεν, ἐφόβησεν (Buecheler, Umb., p. 100), Afghan, *tarhēdal* 'sich fürchten, fliehen', connected by Foy (K. Z. 37, 538) with the same root.

<sup>4</sup> For cognate words in Armenian see BB. 28, 309 and 29, 41.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Rhein. Mus. 58, 315. For other deities associated with the idea of fear, cf. Roscher, under *Deimos*, *Pallor*, *Pavor*, and under *Personifikation* cols. 2095, 2107, 2113. Apuleius, 10, 31, has *Terror* et *Metus*. See Carter, "Abstract Deities in early Roman Religion", Proceedings APA. 36, xxxiv.

we have *fuga, formidine terrore compleatis*,<sup>1</sup> with which we may compare Umb. *tursitu tremitu* and Livy 8, 9, 7, *hostes . . . terrore formidineque adficiatis*. Cf. Livy 10, 28, 16. Roscher gives φοβερά, "Feinde-scheuchend", as an epithet of Athena. Φύξιος is occasionally used of Zeus. In an early inscription of Selinunte, IGA. 515, φόβος is put directly after Zeus, διὰ τὸν Δία νικῶμες καὶ διὰ τὸν φόβον (see Usener, Götternamen 367, and Holm, Rhein. Mus. 27, 363 f.). With Juppiter Territor may also be compared Ζεὺς τροπαῖος.<sup>2</sup> Varro, Men. 61, has "ideo *fuga* hostium Graece vocatur τροπή". Dionysius (II 56), speaking of the Poplifugium, says, διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν φασὶ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ᾗ τὸ πάθος ἐγένετο τῆς τροπῆς τοῦ πλήθους ἐπώνυμον εἶναι καὶ μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων ὄχλου φυγὴν καλεῖσθαι. Cf. Plutarch, Romulus 29. The scholiast on Sophocles, Antigone 143, explains τροπαίφ by διὰ τὸ φυγαδεύειν καὶ τροπήν ποιεῖν τῶν πολεμίων.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare Thulin, Italische Sakrale Poesie und Prosa, p. 56. Plautus, Merc. 25, has *terror et fuga*; Pseud. 590, *metum et fugam*. Cf. Horace, C. 2, 1, 18; Epist. 2, 1, 182; Verg. A. 9, 719.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Osc. Διουφει Φερσορει and *Diuvei Verehasiui*; on ζεὺς τροπαῖος see Frazer's Pausanias, Vol. 3, p. 321.

<sup>3</sup> Note on *extorris* and *territorium*. In view of the connection of *terrere* with the idea of putting to flight, and the admitted fact that we should expect in the earliest Latinity *torrere* as the causative form, just as we have in Umb. *tursitu = torreto*, it seems to me probable that *extorris* has nothing to do with *terra*, although connected with it in popular etymology (cf. Nonius, p. 14 M), but is to be derived from \**torrere = terrere*. The earlier form was perhaps *extorris* like *eximius* (cf. Brugmann I. F. 18, 66 and 382). Compare Isidorus, Or. X 85, *extorris cum vi expulsus et cum terrore solo patrio eiectus*, and Ovid Met. I 727, *et profugum per totum terruit orbem*; also Met. 14, 518. When we compare the relation of *φυγαδευτήριον* to *φυγαδεύω* it is hard to resist the belief that *territorium* stands in a similar relation to *terreo*. I need not here repeat all the ancient etymologies given by Voss in his Etymologicon. Aelius Stilo's derivation of both *terra* and *territorium* from *terere* is of course absurd, but his testimony (Varro, L. L. V 21) "*Tera* in augurum libris scripta cum *R uno*" is interesting. Stolz (H. G. 465) regards *territorium* as connected with *terra*, but admits that the form is 'vereinzelt' and only to be explained by analogy. The word is old, though not appearing early in literature. It naturally occurs most often in the Gromatici, who recognize a connection with *terreo*. As in the Digests it is explained "*quod magistratus ibi ius terrendi habeat*", so Frontinus de controversiis (Lachmann, Vol. I, p. 19) says, "*sed si rationem appellationis huius tractemus, territorium est quidquid hostis terrendi causa constitutum est*". Hyginus (I, p. 115), "*Hic et occupatorius ager dicitur eo quod occupatus est a victore populo territis exinde fugatisque hostibus*". Siculus Flaccus (I, p. 137), "*praemensumque quod universis suffecturum videbatur solum, territis fugatisque inde hostibus, territoria dixerunt*". The derivation is accepted by Rudorff (II, p. 252). Compare Caesar, B. G. VI

Buecheler (*Umbrica*, p. 115), in dealing with the passage quoted above concerning the pursuit of the heifers, compares the Athenian *δίωγμα* (*ἀποδίωγμα*) and also the *Poplifugium*.<sup>1</sup> As to the origin of this festival<sup>2</sup> the ancients themselves were not clear, but according to one version it was connected with the mysterious disappearance of Romulus,<sup>3</sup> and an inscription referring to it would be in place near the reputed tomb of Romulus. I propose to read therefore POPLIFVCIOD. There seem to be some traces of C = G on the stone. For the ablative compare Tab. Iguv. II a, 18, *Huntia* (= at the Hontus festival) fertu katlu, and in Latin *Castud*, *Ludis Megalensibus*, etc. The *Poplifugium*

23 and IV 3. But *terreo* (\**terseo*) may originally have meant 'to fear', 'to flee from fright',—compare *τρέω*, *ἄτρεστος*; Hesych., *ἐτρεσεν*, *ἐφόβησεν*,—and only after *torreo* (perhaps in competition with *torrere* (\**torsere*) 'to parch') had become obsolete, assumed the active meaning 'to frighten', just as in the Vulgate *fugare* and *fugere* are confused (cf. Rhein. Mus. 34, 638), and in the Reichenau Glossary *perterrui* is explained by *tremuit*. *Territor* may then have had the meaning of Plautine *fugitor*, and *territorium* may have had the meaning of *refugium*, *φυγαδευτήριον*, *asylum*. Servius, A. 8, 635, has "Romulus . . . *asylum* condidit ad quem locum si quis *confugisset*". Plutarch, *Romulus* 19, calls the *asylum* *τὸ φύξιμον* (cf. *asylum* in Thesaurus and Corp. Gl.). Of course the word early lost (doubtless under the influence of *terra*) any such association, and could not have been used by Livy or any extant earlier writer in the sense of *asylum*, and when Silius Flaccus (I, p. 162) says, "*Collegia sacerdotum itemque virgines habent agros et territoria*", it had for him no such meaning. Although the Romans themselves never expressed a doubt as to the existence of the *asylum* as helping to explain the growth of the new colony, modern criticism has thrown it to the winds, and one of the arguments used is that *asylum* is a borrowed word. Ihne, *Röm. Gesch.* I, p. 14, says, "Verschiedener Art ist die Erzählung vom Asyl. Es ist in ihr nichts übernatürliches, und obgleich sie dem Römischen Stolz nicht sehr schmeichelte, ist sie doch nie von den Römern angezweifelt worden". Varro, L. L. V 21, defines *territorium* as "*coloni locus communis, qui prope oppidum relinquitur*"; and *coloni*, *ἀποικοί*, both in ancient and modern times have often been *φυγάδες*.

<sup>1</sup> Although Dionysius VI 90 connects *Ζεὺς δειμάτιος* with the first secession of the plebs, and his words imply a sort of panic-flight, and although in VI 62, 68, and 96 he speaks of the seceders as *φυγάδες*, I am not bold enough to connect the *Poplifugium* with the secession of the plebs. The institution seems to be much too ancient for that. But perhaps inscriptions like ours with *Juppiter Territor* may have had some influence in shaping the legend of the secession.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Wissowa (*Religion der Römer*, p. 102), Aust (*Religion der Römer*, p. 183), Fowler (*Roman Festivals*, p. 174), Frazer (*Lectures on the Early History of the Kings*, p. 264; and his *Pausanias*, Vol. 2, p. 492, and 3, p. 268), Otto (*Philologus* 64, 185).

<sup>3</sup> Dionysius II 56.



fell on the fifth of July, and in the Calendar of Amiternum is called *Feriae Jovi*. The festival stood in close connection with that of the *Nonae Caprotinae*, and both ancient and modern writers<sup>1</sup> have confused the two. Plutarch (Romulus 27 and 29, Camillus 33), Cicero, de Republica I 16, 25, and Solinus, I 21, all put the disappearance or death of Romulus on the *Nonae Quinctiles*. Varro (L. L. VI 18) does not connect the *Dies Poplifugia* with the death of Romulus, and seems to keep it separate from the *Nonae Caprotinae*. Perhaps originally the festival of the Poplifugium extended over several days.<sup>2</sup> Dionysius (VI 95) speaks of a third day being added to the *Feriae Latinae* on account of the return of the plebs after their secession αἰς ἡ τρίτη τότε προσε-  
νεμήθη τῆς καθόδου τῶν ἀποστάντων ἕνεκα. This testimony is discredited by Werner.<sup>3</sup> If our inscription were only a fragment of a larger inscription one might supply *die tertiod*, but I see no way of connecting our inscription with the *Feriae Latinae* which were primarily celebrated on the Alban Mount.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, on the analogy of *postridie*, *meridie*, etc. we might expect a different form.

The last letter visible in line 10 is V, the letter beginning line 11 is M. I propose to read VITVLATIONEM. The Didot translator of Dionysius, at a loss to translate χαριστήρια, VI 95 ('Αποδόντες δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει θεοῖς χαριστήρια), uses the paraphrase "cum autem dis . . . victimas et sacrificia, ut ipsis gratias agerent, persolvissent". The Greek uses χαριστήρια and εὐχαριστήρια (εὐχαριστοῦντες) of thank offerings.<sup>5</sup> The same idea is expressed I think by *vitulatio*, which only occurs once in Latin literature, Macrobius (S. 3, 2, 14), "Piso ait *vitulam victoriam* nominari, cuius rei hoc argumentum profert, quod postridie Nonas Julias re bene gesta, cum pridie

<sup>1</sup> E. g., Schwegler, Röm. Gesch. I 532; Ihne, Rhein. Mus. 9, 361.

<sup>2</sup> Farnell (The Cults of the Greek States III, p. 86) says of the Thesmophoria "The day may have been called *θεσμοφορία* because it was the first day of the whole festival". Similarly perhaps *Dies Poplifugia*. Fowler (Festivals, p. 174) remarks, "Nor can we explain the singular fact that this is the only festival in the whole year marked in large capitals in the Calendars which falls before the Nones". Is it possible to suppose that in the earliest Calendar the Nones of July fell on the 5th, and that the confusion in regard to the *Nonae Caprotinae* arose in this way, when the *Nonae* were changed to the 7th?

<sup>3</sup> De Feriis Latinis, p. 23.

<sup>4</sup> For a simultaneous celebration at Rome see Werner, p. 35.

<sup>5</sup> Compare *θυσίας χαριστηρίους* (Dessau 8805 and Dionysius VI 95).

populus a Tuscis in fugam versus sit, unde Poplifugia vocantur, post victoriam *certis sacrificiis fiat vitulatio*".<sup>1</sup> Harper's dictionary translates *Vitulatio* by 'public thanksgiving', Georges by "Siegesopfer", Wissowa (Religion 371 A, 5) by 'freudiger opferakt'. As Fowler points out, the meaning of the word was entirely unknown to Roman scholars. See the whole passage Macrobius S. 3, 2, 11-16.<sup>2</sup> The definition of Macrobius, "nomen sacrifici ob laetitiam facti", we may perhaps accept but not the connection with *vita*, *voce laetari*, *victoria*, or *vitulus*. Plautus in a corrupt passage (Persa 251 ff.) has

*Iovi opulento, incluto, Ope gnato*  
*Supremo, valido, viripotent*  
*Opes, spes bonas, copias commodanti*  
 . . . *lubens vitulorque merito;*

and as Fowler remarks, "If the *vitulatio* is in any way connected with the *Poplifugia*, as it was indeed in the legend as given by Macrobius, it may be worth while to remember that that day is marked in one calendar as *feriae Iovi*". The etymology of *vitulatio* is as difficult for us as it was for the ancients.<sup>3</sup> It has occurred to me that perhaps the word may be connected with the root seen in Umb. *eveietu*. This is used twice in the Tab. Iguv.; II b, 8, si perakne, sevakne upetu, *eveietu*=suem sollemnem, hostiam deligito, *voveto* (Buck), and II b, 11, kapru perakne, sevakne upetu, *eveietu*=caprum sollemnem, hostiam deligito, *voveto*. It will be seen that *upetu* would correspond to *capia*=*delecta* in our inscription, and *eveietu* to *vitulationem*<sup>4</sup> in the sense of 'offering'.

<sup>1</sup>One may perhaps compare the modern place in Campania *Vitulazio* (Nissen, Italische Landeskunde II 694). For *Vitulasius* see Schulze (Eigennamen 153 and 381).

<sup>2</sup>Nonius, 14 M, has "*vitulantes veteres gaudentes dixerunt, dictum a bonae vitae commodo; sicuti qui nunc est in summa laetitia vivere eum dicimus*"; Paulus similarly, "*Vitulans laetans gaudio*".

<sup>3</sup>Walde connects it with \**voi*, Ausruf gehobener Festesfreude (cf. Gr. εὐοῖ), which unfortunately is not attested for Latin. He may be right, and one might compare *iubilatio* and *gratulatio*, connected by Walde with Skt. *gr̥nāti* (singt, lobt). An interesting semasiological parallel to *vitulari*, *vitulatio* is furnished by A. S. *lācan* 'play', 'sport' (Goth. *laikan* 'leap', 'dance'), and A. S. *lāc*, 'play', 'offering', 'gift', 'sacrifice', surviving in 'wed-lock'. The following equations seem to be suggestive, *gratus* : *ingratus* :: \**vitus* : *invitus*, *gratulor* : *gratus* :: *vitulor* : \**vitus*; but the derivation of *invitus* is not certain, see Walde.

<sup>4</sup>For the apposition of *vitulationem* and *uxmenta* compare Dessau 3234, "hoce seignum pro Cn. filiod donum dedit"; 3237, "Dianae aidicolam votum dedit meretod", rendered in Greek by Ἀράματα εὐχὰν ναϊσκον ἀπέδωκε.

The derivation of *eveiētu* is not certain. Buecheler (Umbrica 142) connected it with *evincire*, but it is now generally connected with the root seen in *victuma*, Ger. *weihe*.<sup>1</sup> The absence of *c* in *vitulor* makes a difficulty but has its parallel in *Vitoria* from an archaic inscription of Praeneste<sup>2</sup> (CIL. I 58). Of course in our inscription the spelling may have been *viktulatio* or *veitulatio*. If my conjecture is correct, it would give us some idea of the length of the lines. I have supplied 10 letters, which added to the 12 preserved in l. 11 would make 22; but the letters in this line are unusually crowded; l. 10 in the same space only contains 10 letters; l. 9 in a little less space only six, one of which is M, equivalent ordinarily to at least two letters. The full line then might contain anywhere from sixteen to twenty-two letters, dependent on the size of the letters and the interspaces, which vary considerably in the parts preserved. My restoration is based on this assumption, but of course we have no warrant that at the upper end of the inscription the lines ended at precisely the same point. The graver may have preferred to begin a new word or at least a new syllable on another line. Cf. *es/ed*, ll. 2/3; *kalato/rem*, ll. 8/9; *vxmen/ta*, ll. 10/11. In the case of *vitulationem*, there probably was not room for the M on the preceding line,<sup>3</sup> but as M takes a great deal of space, the scribe may not have realized this until after he had written NE.

In the Greek sacrificial inscriptions it is customary to mention what part of the sacrifice the priests and other participants are to

<sup>1</sup> See Osthoff, I. F. 6, 39. In BB. 24, 184, he connects English 'witch' with the same root.

<sup>2</sup> For other examples cf. Zimmermann, Rhein. Mus. 45, 493, BB. 25, 69; I. F. 19, Anzeiger 30; Ernout, MSL, 13, 340; Hey, ALL. 15, 275; and Mohl, Chronologie du Latin Vulgaire, p. 313 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Thurneysen, Rhein. Mus. 55, 484, finds a difficulty in this separation of M from the rest of the word on the preceding line, although he admits it to be possible in so old an inscription. In his own reordering of the lines he admits *ha/m*. Some perhaps would prefer to make M = *Maxumoi*, just as we find at the beginning of an inscription *μεγάλη Νέμεσις* (Dessau 3738), but this order would be most unusual. *Sancto* in later inscriptions frequently precedes the name of the deity as it does in *Sancto Jovi Territori*, but that a five-stroked *m* should here stand by mistake for an Etruscan M = S = *Sanctoi* is most improbable. Compare however *Mirqurios Alixentrom* (for *Alixentros*) (CIL. XIV 4099; Conway, Italic Dialects, p. 317, and Lattes, Iscrizione Paleolatine, p. 43). If *dotau* is accepted, as it stands as an imperative form, M may be the last letter of *piaculum*, *sacrificium* or some similar word.

receive as perquisites and what part the people.<sup>1</sup> Thus in the Calendar of Cos immediately before τὸν δὲ κριθέντα τῷ Ζηνί we have (ZP. I n. 5, l. 22 ff.) γέρη δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ δέρμα καὶ τὸ σκέλος, ἱεροποιοὶ δὲ σκέλος, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κρέα τὰς πόλιος, and in l. 50 ff., shortly after βοῦς ὁ κριθεὶς θύεται Ζηνὶ Πολιῇ, we find γέρη τοῦ βοῦς τῷ ἱερῇ δέρμα καὶ σκέλος· ἱερὰ ἱαρεὺς παρέχει — ε — καὶ ἥπατος ἥμισυ καὶ κοιλίας ἥμισυ θναφόρῳ δὲ τοῦ σκέλεος τοῦ τῶν ἱεροποιῶν δίδοται ἀκρίσχιον νώτου δίκρεας . . . . ., ἱατροῖς κρέας, αὐλητῶν κρέας, χαλκίων καὶ κεραμέων ἐκατέροις τὸ κεφάλαιον, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κρέα τὰς πόλιος.<sup>2</sup> In our inscription I believe there was no reference to the perquisites of the priest, but rather to the so-called *visceratio* such as is implied in τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κρέα τὰς πόλιος. Compare ZP. II, n. 29, l. 16, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κρέα Ἀθηναίοις μερίζει, and l. 24, νεμόντων τὰ κρέα τῷ δῆμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων ἐν Κεραμεικῷ καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις κρεανομίαις ἀποδιδόντες τὰς μερίδας εἰς τὸν δῆμον ἕκαστον κατὰ τοὺς πέμποντας ὁπόσους ἂν παρέχη ὁ δῆμος ἕκαστος. Cf. Athenaeus VI 27, "καὶ τῷ ἀνακείῳ ἐπὶ τίνος στήλης γέγραπται 'τοῖν δὲ βοσὶν τοῖν ἡγεμόνοι τοῖν ἐξαιρούμενων (= eximius, kapia) τὸ μὲν τρίτον μέρος εἰς τὸν ἀγῶνα, τὰ δὲ δύο μέρη τὸ μὲν ἕτερον τῷ ἱερεῖ, τὸ δὲ τοῖς παρασίτοις.'"

Compare the following glosses: *asignae* κρέα μεριζόμενα (Buecheler, ALL. I 103); *Viscerationem* εὐφρασίαν (C. Gl. II 209, 53); *Διανομηκρέως visceratio* (II 273, 5); *Visceratio* ἀρτόκρεας (II 209, 48). Persius (6, 50) has "oleum *artocreasque* popello largior", with which compare CIL. IX 5309, ornetur dedicatione artocria populo cuprensi dedit. *Visceratio* is found in the following inscriptions: IX, 23; X, 451; VIII, 1321,—ob dedicatione congentialibus et sacerdotibus *viscerationem* et *epulum*;<sup>3</sup> also in another African inscription reported by Cagnat, Revue Archéologique 29 (1898), p. 394, ob dedicationem *visce[rationem]* populo? dedit. Servius A, VI 253, commenting on the line

solida imponit taurorum viscera flammis

says, "non exta dicit sed carnes nam *viscera* sunt quicquid inter

<sup>1</sup> Compare Dessau 4906 (Lex Furfonensis) at the end. Sei quei ad huc templum rem deivnam fecerit Iovi Libero aut Iovis genio *pelleis coria fanei* sunt. See also Dessau 4916. For Semitic parallels see Haupt, Journ. of Bib. Lit. 19, 59; for India Oldenberg, Die Religion des Veda, pp. 326 ff. and 360.

<sup>2</sup> For other similarly precise regulations see ZP. I, numbers 4, 6, 8; II, numbers 10, 24, 25, 48, 113, 129, 144; Michel, 726 and 854.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Sueton., Caesar 38, Adiecit epulum ac *viscerationem*; Solinus I, 10, consaeptum etiam intra quod ritus sacrorum, *factis bovicidiis* . . . etenim cum *viscerationem* sacricolis daret. On the references to *visceratio* in Umbrian see Buecheler, Umbrica, p. 41 and p. 140.

ossa<sup>1</sup> et cutem<sup>2</sup> est, unde etiam *visceratio* dicitur ut diximus supra" = I 211, where his note runs "*viscera* non tantum intestina dicimus, sed quicquid sub corio est, ut in Albano Latinis *visceratio* dicitur, id est caro". (Cf. Servius A, 3, 321 and 622.) I propose to read *viskesa kapitod quoi ha velod*. *Kapitod* would correspond to λαμβάνειν,<sup>3</sup> the word commonly used in Greek inscriptions. Dionysius, IV 49, describing the *feriae Latinae*, has the words τάξας ἃ δὲ παρέχειν ἐκάστην πόλιν εἰς τὰ ἱερά καὶ μοῖραν, ἣν ἐκάστην δεήσει λαμβάνειν. Pliny, N. H. 3, 9, 69, uses the compound *accipere*, "et cum his *carnem* in monte Albano soliti *accipere* populi Albenses" etc. Cicero, pro Planc. 8, 23, has *carnem Latinis petant*. In commenting on this passage the Scholia Bobiensia have "civitates adiacentes *portiunculas carnis acciperent*". Varro, LL. 6, 25, has *carnem petere*. *Capitod* = λαμβάνω accords better with Greek usage than would *petitod*. For the order *keiviom quoi* compare the well-known inscription from Luceria, CIL. IX 782, *ceivium quis volet* pro iudicatod n(umum) L manum iniectio estod; and Tab. Ig. VII a, 52, *hatuto tolar pisi heriest* = capiunto *civitatis quisquis volet*. *Quoiha*<sup>4</sup> is written as one word because

<sup>1</sup> In view of this passage should not *os* (= *oss*? as *es* = *ess*) be translated 'bone' in Mil. 30?—

pol si quidem

conixus esses, per corium, per viscera

perque os elephanti transmineret brachium.

Ribbeck translates "zum Maul hinaus"; Bentley emended to *ossa*; cf. Men. 859.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Isidorus Or. XI 1, 16, *Viscera* non tantum intestina dicimus, sed quicquid sub corio est, a visco quod est inter cutem et carnem; Seneca, Herc. Oet. 1262, ecce direpta cute *viscera* manus detexit. The Codex Medicus of Vergil glosses *dapes*, in Ecl. VI 79, by *viscera*. See also Lucilius 474, with Marx' note.

<sup>3</sup> In the inscription of the second century = ZP. II, n. 46, discussed by Maas, Orpheus (p. 26), αἰρέτω is used, l. 123, Μερῶν δὲ γενομένων αἰρέτω ἱερεὺς, ἀν-θερεὺς, etc. See Maas, p. 49, and CIL. XIV 2112, cited by him.

<sup>4</sup> For *quoiha* I suggest two other possibilities, neither of which seems to be probable. 1. *ha* is an enclitic particle (cf. Skt. *ha*, Umb. *hont* in *erihont*, O. H. G. *ihha*, but see Brugmann, K. Z. 36, 406) and *quoiha* is used like *oīye*. See Brugmann, Die Demonstrativ Pronomina, p. 69. 2. *quoiha* = *quoia*, *h* being inserted to prevent hiatus. In the examples I cite, however, *h* comes before *i*, not after it: *quohi* for *quoi*, Plaut., Poen. 824 (Birt, Der Hiatus bei Plautus, p. 25); *Stahius* and *Stahia* for *Staius* (CIL. X 5372); *Sehius* = *Seius* (Eph. Epig. IV 72, n. 26); *fohiios* for *Boius* (Veneti, Pauli, Altit. F. III 344 and 401). *Quoiha* might then be compared with ποῖα, ὁποῖα, for which I cite here only one example from a very interesting inscription of Iasos of the fifth century B. C. (Hicks, Gk. Insc. of the Brit. Mus., 440 = Michel, 724), κατὰ τὰδε ἱεράσθω ὁ



*ha* is enclitic just as *quoiho(m)* in l. 1. (See Thurneysen, Rhein. Mus. 55, 485.) *Ha* = *haec*; cf. *ista, illa*. As *velod* begins the next line there was no need of punctuation, and it is not necessary to read *havelod*, the word which has caused so much trouble. *Velod* itself is undoubtedly difficult, and Thurneysen's explanation, which makes it equivalent to *voluntate*, does not seem to me probable. The graver of the inscription was not above making mistakes, some of which he has corrected. Uncorrected mistakes even in official inscriptions are not unknown; cf. *utra* for *verba* and *sacanal* for *bacanal* in the Sen. Cons. de Bacchanalibus, *maio-rem* for *maiorum* in Dessau 38, *otiiis* for *ollis*, Dessau 5039 (Arval Brethren Insc. containing Carmen Arvale). The most probable supposition seems to me to be that *velod* is a mistake for *voled* = *volet* or for *velid*, and of the two *voled* seems more likely if we regard the usage of inscriptions and of Umbrian. The *d* of *voled*, which is irregular, would be supported by *esed* of l. 1, if that is equal to *erit*. Unfortunately we have no word in the inscription ending in *t*, and we do not know but that all final *t*'s would have been *d*'s. According to the index of CIL., Vol. I, *volet* occurs 25 times (*quei volet* 12 X), *volent* twice, *velit* 4 times, all other forms of *velle* 12 times. In the Laws of the XII Tables *volet* occurs 5 times; viz., (ed. Schoell) 1, 4, *quis volet*, *vindex esto*; 3, 3, *si volet*; 3, 4, *si volet (bis)*; 7, 7, *qua volet iumenta agito*, for which Cic., pro Caec. 19, 54, has *iubet qua velit agere iumentum*. Compare Dessau 6086 (Lex Municipii Tarentini), *eiusque pecuniae quei volet*, *petitio est*; 6087 (Lex Ursonensis), c. LXXV, *qui volet* *petitio persecutioque esto*, a formula used repeatedly in this and similar inscriptions.<sup>1</sup> I of course should prefer to keep *velod* in the sense of *volet* or *velit* if the form could

ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ μεγίστου. Λαμβανέτω δὲ τῶν θνομένων σκέλος ἐν ὁποῖον ἂν θέλῃ. For similar phraseology compare ZP. II, n. 65, l. 30, θνεῖν δὲ ἐξεῖν ἅπαν ὅτι ἂν βόληται ἕκαστος; ZP. II, n. 119, τῷ Ἐρμα θνέτω ἱρήιον ὅττι κε θέλῃ; II, n. 109, A, ἅμ βόληι = ἅν; II, n. 26, οὐ ἅμ βόληται. But Cato used *quonium* = *cuius* in an old religious formula, Agr. 139. Oscan has *puuin* = *quoia* and the equation of *quoiha* with *poia* seems too venturesome to commend approval. Its acceptance would of course necessitate a change in the proposed supplements; e. g., with *rex* as the implied subject, *viskesa kapitod hostiaso*] M QVOIHA VELOD. There would not be room for detailed mention of different parts of the victims.

<sup>1</sup> Instead of *qui volet* we find, Dessau 8240, *eius rei persecutio cuilibet de populo datur*, with which may be compared the formulae common in Greek inscriptions, ἐξουσία ἐστω τῷ θέλοντι, ἐξέστω τῷ θέλοντι.

be plausibly explained. It is barely conceivable that we have here a sort of contamination of the subj. and imper. which must often have been used with nearly equivalent force. Similarly in the Luceria inscription (Conway, *It. Dial.*, p. 31) the peculiar forms *fundatid parentatid*, if well attested, may be an imp. *-tod* influenced by a subj. *-id*, although Oscan influence may be suspected. Umb. has *veltu* = \**veltod* = \**veletod* and early Latin may have had a similar form, due to whose influence *velod* appears for *velid*. This, however, is a mere hypothesis and a rather hazardous one. Fay, A. J. P. XV, 420, thinks that *tegilot* is the result of syncretism of \**teget* and \**tegod*, and in a private letter he compares with *velod* the Lesbian imper. *μύρω* from *μύρωμι*. (Brugmann, *Vgl.*, Gr. II<sup>1</sup> § 957, p. 1317, who compares \**dō* in Lat. *cedō*.) *D* may then have come from other imperative forms.<sup>1</sup>

The remainder of the inscription I would supplement so as to read *neque skelos estod sakrufikiod iovestod loiquiod*. In the *Lex Furfonensis* (Dessau 4906) we have *sine scelere, sine piaculo*; in the dedication of an altar (Dessau 4909), *si quit sacrifici quo volet ferre et ibi ubi volet, uti sine scelere sine fraude lic[et]*. Livy, XXII 10, quotes a solemn ordinance in regard to the *ver sacrum* in which these words occur "si id moritur, quod fieri oportebit, profanum esto, *neque scelus esto*, si quis rumpet occidetve insciens, ne fraus esto, si quis clepsit, ne populo *scelus esto*". The formula *neque skelos estod* in our inscription would seem to hark back to a time when it was ordinarily considered wrong to eat the flesh of oxen. Cicero, N. D. 2, 159, quoting Aratus says,

" Ferrea tum vero proles exorta repente est  
Ausaque funestum prima est fabricarier ensem  
Et gustare manu vinctum domitumque iuvenum.

Tanta putabatur utilitas percipi e bubus ut eorum *visceribus vesci scelus haberetur*".<sup>2</sup> The words of Aratus are, Phaen. 132, *πρωτοι*

<sup>1</sup> Other hypothesis which have occurred to me, but which do not seem plausible, are: 1. *velod* = *veloid*; cf. *βούλοιτο* and the explanation proposed above for *dot*. 2. *velod* = *velont* from \**velo* before it became *volo*, and with *n* dropped as in *coraverot, dedrot*, CIL. I 173, and frequently in Oscan; cf. *set* = *sent* = *sunt*. Nicholson, *Keltic Researches*, pp. 154 and 157, interprets *sot* in a lead tablet found at Amelie les Bains (CIL. XII 5367) as = Lat. *sont* and *metat* = *metant* from Stokes's \**met mat*, fühlen (?); *mitat* in the Duenos insc. has been interpreted as *mittant*. In this case *quoi* would be plural and we should have to supply *kapiant* or *kapiantod*. For *-ot* (pronounced *od*) in Irish from *-ont* cf. Thurneysen, K. Z. 37, 423.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Vergil, G. 2, 537, "impia quam caesis gens est epulata iuvenis", on which Servius comments, "Arati est hoc, qui dicit maiores bovem comesse

δὲ βοῶν ἐπάσαντ' ἀροτήρων, on which the scholiast remarks ἀσεβὲς εἶναι ἐδόκει τὸν ἀρότην σφάξαι.<sup>1</sup> Germanicus translates, Aratea 136, Polluit et taurus mensas adsuetus aratro. Varro, R. R. 2, 5, 4, says, "hic socius hominum in rustico opere et Cereris minister, ab hoc antiqui manus ita abstineri voluerunt ut capite sanxerint, si quis occidisset, qua in re testis Attice, testis Peloponnesos, nam ab hoc pecore Athenis Buzuges nobilitatus, Argis homogyros".<sup>2</sup> Cf. Pliny, N. H. 8, 180, socium enim laboris agrique culturae habemus hoc animal tantae apud priores curae, ut sit inter exempla damnatus a populo Romano die dicta qui concubinae procaci rure omassum edisse se negante occiderat bovem, actusque in exilium tamquam colono suo interempto". I write *sakru-fikiod* with *u* rather than *i* because this seems to have been the earlier form; cf. George's Lex. der Lat. Wortformen under *sacrificium* and *sacrificare*. Neither word occurs in Vol. I<sup>1</sup> of the Corpus. For *f* of course *FH* may have been written as in the Numasios inscription. So too in *Poplifugiod*.

That *Iovestod* = *iusto* is now generally conceded. I have pointed out in Harvard Studies (XI, 163) that the gloss of Paulus, p. 74, *iovistae* compositum a *Jove* et *iustae*, shows that such a form was not unknown to ancient grammarians. *Iustum sacrificium* is used by Servius (Dan.), A. III 279, "ergo quoniam non ad *iustum sacrificium* Iovem invocaverint, ideo illi piaculum solvunt". Macrobius, S. 3, 11, 7, uses *iusta libatio*. Cicero, N. D. III 38, has "*Iustitia* quae suum cuique distribuit"; Cicero, De Leg. 2, 30, *iustae* religionis; Suetonius, Cluad. 21, *iustum* atque *legitimum* (munus). Cato, Agr. 139, in a formula manifestly old, has "si deus, si dea es, quoniam illud sacrum est, uti tibi *iustus* est porco *piaculo facere*" etc. I take *iustum* in the sense of the Greek νόμιμον, by which it is glossed, Corp. Gl. II 336, 38 and 396, 57, or in the sense of καθήκον. *Plus iusto*<sup>3</sup> is glossed, Corp. Gl. II 152, 38, ἰλέον τοῦ καθήκοντος. I shall content myself with citing only a few examples in point from Greek inscriptions: ZP. II, n. 48, l. 16, ὁ δὲ θυσιάζων τῇ ἐβδόμῃ τὰ καθήκοντα πάντα ποιεῖται τῷ θεῷ, followed immediately by λαμβανέτω δὲ τῆς θυσίας ἧς ἂν φέρῃ σκέλος καὶ ὤμον,

nefas putabant". See Sueton., Dom. 9, and compare βοῦφόνε, Homeric Hymns, Hermes 436, with the comment of Allen and Sykes in their edition (London, 1904).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. von Prott and Stengel, Rhein. Mus. 52, 198, n. 2, and 409.

<sup>2</sup> Wilamovitz (Hermes 37, 307) emends to *bomagiros*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Sidonius, Epist. 3, 3, 9, *iusto plusculum*.

τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ κατακοπτόμεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ; in the same insc., l. 9, παρέχειν δὲ καὶ τῇ θεῇ τὸ καθήκον, and l. 23, ὁμοίως δὲ παρέξουσιν οἱ ἐρανισταὶ τὰ καθήκοντα τῷ θεῷ; CIA. II I, 622, καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς θυσίας ἃς καθήκεν θύειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινού; ZP. II, n. 129, VI 9, παρέχει δὲ καὶ στεφάνος τοῖς ἥρωσι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τὰ ποτὶ τὰν θυσίαν πάντα καὶ καρπώσει τὰ τε ἐκ τοῦ ἱερείου νομιζόμενα ἱερά; and just before τοῖς θεοῖς τὰ τε ἐκ τοῦ ἱερείου νενομισμένα ἱερά, ZP. II, n. 48, θύειν τοὺς γεωργοὺς καὶ τοὺς προσχώρους τοῖν θεοῖν ἢ θέμις καὶ τὰς μοῖρας νέμειν; ZP. II, n. 46, l. 113, ὁ ἱερεὺς δὲ ἐπιτελείτω τὰς ἐθίμους λειτουργίας; ZP. II, n. 7, l. 10, κατὰ τὰ ἀρχαῖα νόμιμα; l. 24, ὅπως μηδέποτε τοῦτο ἐκλειφθεῖ μηδὲ ὀλιγωρηθεῖ ποτὲ τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας; ZP. II, n. 28, l. 9, ὁμόσαντας τὸν νόμιμον ὄρκον. Cf. Dionysius, I 24, εἰ δὲ δὴ καὶ τούτων λάβοιεν τὴν δικαίαν μοῖραν and τοὺς τε θεοὺς τὰ δίκαια ὑπουργεῖν ἀξιοῦντες.

Thurneysen, Rhein. Mus. 56, 162, has already accepted the reading *loiquiod* and connected it with *linguere*, λοιπός. He even suggests that it may refer to the remains of a sacrifice. I take it of course as a verbal adjective like *capios*.<sup>1</sup> For the *o* compare λοιπός, λέλοιπα, *socius*, *gomia*. Walde derives the perfect *liqui* from *loiqui*. *Reliquiae* (sc. *partes*) is probably itself a verbal adjective formed like *eximius*. The Greek inscriptions furnish some striking parallels to the use of *loiquiod*, except that the Greeks usually mention the gods first, and then the share left for mortals. Compare ZP. II, n. 58, l. 96 (a very important long inscription from Andania of the early part of the first century B. C.), Ἱεροῦ δείπνον. οἱ ἱεροὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θυμάτων τῶν ἀγομένων ἐν ταῖς πομπαῖς ἀφελόντες ἀφ' ἑκάστου τὰ νόμιμα (= *iustod*) τοῖς θεοῖς τὰ λοιπὰ κρέα καταχρησάσθωσαν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν δείπνον; ZP. II, n. 131, l. 27 (I give as restored by ZP.), τὰ δὲ κρέα δίδοσθαι τοῖς θύσασιν ἀφαιρέθენტων [ἐπὶ τὰν τράπεζαν τῶν νομιζόμενων = *sakrufikiod iovestod loiquiod*. ZP. supports the restoration by references to n. 156, v. 41, and n. 180, v. 7 (not yet published), and n. 144, C, l. 26 sqq., ἀφαιρεῖν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερείων ἃ ἂν δοκῇ καλῶς ἔχειν ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς πᾶσι ὅσα ἐστ[.] τῶν ἱερείων χρᾶσθω ὁ τὸν γάμον ποιῶν. I would also call attention to ZP. II, n. 129, VI, l. 14, οἱ δὲ ἐπιμήνιοι οἱ θύοντες τὰς θυσίας ταύτας ἀποδωσούντι τῷ κοινῷ τός

<sup>1</sup> This would be of course the earliest example of the Ablative Absolute. The construction is disputed for the Twelve Tables (see ALL. 13, 272) but seems to be Italic, being found in Oscan and Umbrian (see Conway, *Italic Dialects*, p. 501) and in the Paelignian *aetatu firata fertilid* (see Thurneysen, Rhein. Mus. 43, 350).

τε ἐλλύτας πάντας καὶ τῶν σπλάγχων τὰ ἡμίση, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἐξοῦντι αυτοί. ὁ δὲ ἀρτυτὴρ διελεῖ τὰ ἱερὰ τοῖς παροῦσι; and to the use of ὑπολειπόμενα by Suidas under κωλοκρέται, ὅτι νόμος ἦν τὰ ὑπολειπόμενα τῆς θυσίας τοῦς ἱερέας λαμβάνειν ἃ εἰσιν οἷον δέρματα καὶ κωλαί. Compare also Hesychius, *θευμορία*, ἀπαρχή. *θυσία* ἥ ὃ λαμβάνουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς κρέας, ἐπειδὴν θύηται. θεοῦ μοῖρα. To sum up, my restoration of lines 10-16 is as follows:

poplifug]IOD IO (vei) VXMEN  
 TA KAPIA DOTA<sup>1</sup> V[itulatione  
 M I(ovei) TE · RI · T[orei<sup>2</sup> viskesa  
 kapitod keivio]M QVOI HA  
 VELOD<sup>3</sup> NEQV[e skelos estod  
 sakrufiki]OD IOVESTOD  
 LOIQVIOD

I supply, as the subject of *datod*, *rex*, which, as will be seen, I make the subject of the last clause in the preceding inscription. No one can realize more fully than I how doubtful are some of the particular words which I have supplied. Other supplements have occurred to me, but I have given those which seem to me most probable and best supported by inscriptional evidence. While certainty in detail is unattainable, I trust that on the inscription as a whole I have succeeded in shedding some light, and have pointed out the way by which perhaps eventually a more definite solution may be reached.

MINTON WARREN.

<sup>1</sup> Mistake for DATOD.

<sup>2</sup> = *Territori*.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps for VOLED.



## II. — LATIN *vs.* GERMANIC MODAL CONCEPTIONS.

Mr. Jespersen<sup>1</sup> in a recent plea for greater independence in the methods of modern philology, found heart to deprecate the baneful influence of the Latinist's methods upon the philologist who deals with modern languages. His was not the only protest of this nature. The prefaces of Germanic philological works seem to be incomplete at present unless some such warning<sup>2</sup> appears. The protest is no doubt called for; I would by no means deny its timeliness, though I still hope that the division of labor Jespersen desires will not also lead to an ignorance of the many good suggestions which may come from a sane comparison of languages. The fault, however, does not lie on one side alone. It will be necessary here in calling attention to the relationship of Germanic to Latin problems of syntax to point out an equally baneful influence upon the Latin problems that has emanated from the Germanic workshop. My purpose in doing so is of course not simply to retort with a senseless "*tu quoque*" to the protest that I have cited, but rather to call attention to a danger which seems in no slight degree to affect the methods of classical philologists.

The danger to the grammarian of modern languages which Mr. Jespersen has pointed out, as well as the converse danger that I shall attempt to indicate, comes from an unscientific employment of the comparative method. Now this danger will always be present, for all science is monistic. Scientific classification is ultimately satisfied with nothing short of an all-comprehending systematization of all the related facts with which it deals; in the syntax of the Indo-European languages this means so far as possible an attempt to group the constructions of all the Indo-European languages into one comprehensive scheme. The almost insuperable<sup>3</sup> difficulties contained in such a program

<sup>1</sup> *Englische Studien*, 35, pp. 7-12.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. e.g. Behagel: *Syntax des Heliand* (preface); Wunderlich: *Der Deutsche Satzbau*, p. 259; Behagel: *Gebrauch der Zeitformen*, p. 157 "*So sehr also stehen unsere Grammatiker unter dem Bann der lateinischen Syntax*".

<sup>3</sup> The attempt is not hopeless when we take into consideration modal and case forms, as well as the idiomatic forms; for these often prove very stable and tend to restrain the meanings from ranging too widely.

should be evident at once. Syntax deals primarily with semantics. Semantic changes depend very largely upon the caprices of psychology, and even the most positive empiricist does not claim an ability to formulate the laws of thought. The morphological changes involved in the history of words like Gk. *φῆγός*, Lat. *fagus*; Goth. *boka*; book, follow laws that are fairly well understood. The trained philologist if told that the changes were regular could give the series pretty accurately on the basis of any one of them. However, he would find it quite a hopeless task to give the meanings of the cognates in the series on the basis of any one of them. They happen to be about as follows; Gk., "oak"; Lat., "beech"; Goth., "letter of the alphabet"; Eng., "book". We may attempt *ex post facto* to explain the semantic changes here involved, but we have not been able to formulate laws to account for those changes.<sup>1</sup>

Such are the difficulties<sup>2</sup> involved in attempting a science of comparative syntax if it be based upon function alone. Yet syntacticians persist in comparing constructions as to function, speaking e. g. of the Indo-European subjunctives of conditions, indirect discourse, and the potential optative, etc. I shall not condemn such comparisons; I shall only indicate in brief how the modal treatment of Latin, for example, has suffered from categories imposed by conceptions gained in daily intercourse with, and study of the Germanic languages.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> At times while the morphological changes are quite regular the meaning remains quite unchanged throughout, as in the case of *gamyā-te*, *βαίω*, *venio*, *gima*, "come".

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Gildersleeve has repeatedly called attention to the danger of loose comparisons, cf. A. J. P. XXIII, p. 133. See too the law laid down and repeatedly emphasized by Wood regarding the semasiological possibilities of words. In A. J. P. Vol. XX, pp. 254, ff, he shows the great danger of connecting words on the ground of similarity in meaning only. If such caution is needed in treating words, certainly as great caution is needed in syntactical study where the underlying morphological bases are more fickle. Cf. the converse law, A. J. P. Vol. XIX, p. 40, ff.

<sup>3</sup> In a recent paper entitled "A Century of Metaphysical Syntax," Mr. Hale has sketched the influence of Kantian categories upon Latin syntactical terminology. The influence was certainly strong. I would suggest however, that the categories would hardly have been adopted so readily nor retained so persistently had not the vernacular of the grammarians who used them afforded so much apparent support for them. In fact the early German grammarians seem occasionally to have reached such distinctions quite apart from the influence of Wolff and Kant. E. g. *Adelung*, *Lehrgebäude der*

Most of us have been convinced by Delbrück that psychologic forces (as of "will" and "wish") and not metaphysical conceptions formed the basis of the earlier modal usages. Much of the work in Sanskrit, Greek and Latin modal syntax has emanated from this belief, and the work seems to have led to abiding results. When we turn to Germanics, however, we cannot but be impressed by the success with which metaphysical categories seem to define modal distinctions. Delbrück, who did so much to turn syntax away from metaphysical theories, himself returns to them with marked frequency in dealing with Germanic syntax, cf. the ever recurring terms "tatsächlichkeit", "vorstellung", "unwirklichkeit" in his recent article, "Der Germanische Optativ im Satzgefüge".<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Erdmann's *Deutsche Syntax*, Wunderlich's *Deutscher Satzbau*, etc. It must be confessed that the terms are largely satisfactory when applied to the facts of Germanics. The conviction is inevitable that this persistence in the use of such terminology is not entirely due to a slavish copying of Kantian terminology. It is nearer the truth to say that a peculiar<sup>2</sup> metaphysical strain, not so noticeable in the earlier languages, has somehow permeated Germanic modal distinctions. What I wish first to call attention to, therefore, is the frequent

---

deutschen Sprache (II, p. 391 [1782]) says that the German Subjunctive is used *von einer ungewissen Sache*. This is metaphysical, but it does not adopt the phraseology of Wolff or Kant. It antedates by several years the treatises of Haase and Hermann that introduced the Kantian terms into Latin syntax. Furthermore the modern grammarians have had sufficient time to slough off that earlier influence. They are inspired, I believe, not so much by the traditional terminology, as by the actual behavior of the Germanic constructions.

<sup>1</sup> In *Beiträge zur Gesch. Deutsch. Spr. u. Lit.*, 1904, pp. 200-304.

<sup>2</sup> The metaphysical tendency of the Germanic peoples is recognized as a peculiar and characteristic element of their mentality. Why should not this tendency assert itself in the formation of semantic modal distinctions? May not this idea suggest the basis of one law at least for the syntactical psychologist? Certainly the peculiarly logical pragmatism revealed in the history of Latin constructions with *cum*, *quamquam*, *antequam*, and the like (with their careless disregard, or breaking down, of fine functional distinctions), is characteristically Roman and very unlike the behavior of the Germanic constructions spoken of above. I hope not to be misunderstood however. This is not saying that we must believe in general Grundbegriffe for the modal usages. I shall indicate later how I believe semantic changes follow definite idioms and phrases and only such. My point here is simply that a peculiar national temperament may influence the direction of syntactical changes, by affording a path of least resistance.

misinterpretation of some Latin constructions that is chargeable to an ingenuous assumption that the Germanic and Latin constructions which are similar in form are also similar in function and in origin. The discussions of the hypothetical subjunctive, of relative clauses, and of indirect discourse have suffered most perhaps. I shall take the last-named as my chief example, hoping also to suggest a satisfactory solution to the genetic problem involved in the Germanic construction.

Beginning with Behagel (*Gebrauch der Zeitformen*, 1899, p. 164), who in the second part discusses tense and modal usage in Indo-European Indirect Discourse, we shall get a clew to the whole matter. His definition reads: *Der Konjunktiv steht wenn im Hauptsatz ein Verbum sich befindet, das Zweifel, Ungewissheit ausdrückt, d. h. wenn der Nebensatz bloss eine subjective Vorstellung, keine objective Thatsache ausdrückt.* Here the logical distinction appears in its most glaring form. The next example is taken from a brilliant work (Dittmar: *Lat. Modus-Lehre*, Leipzig, 1897), which certainly sets out with psychological nomenclature. To him, as is well known, the subjunctive expresses an attitude of mind which is described by the adjective "polemisch", while the indicative expresses the "souverän" attitude. The word "polemisch" is further defined by other terms, e. g., *quälende Ungewissheit, Zweifel, übermässige Leere, Furcht*, etc., (p. 81). That is purely psychology, and he is generally consistent as regards his point of view. Some trouble ensues, however, when he attempts to apply this general notion to the various constructions. He has little to say about Indirect Discourse, but what he says furnishes another example of that to which I am calling attention. For instance, one finds on pp. 202-3 that in the subjunctive of Indirect Discourse this attitude of *Furcht, Zweifel*, etc., is in reality a fear, uncertainty, skepticism as to the *actuality* of the statement which is being quoted, or, at least, a refusal to vouch for its actuality. His words are: *Und so tritt denn der Konjunktiv-Optativ dann ein, wenn der Sprecher ausdrücklich andeuten will, dass eine Begründung oder Ansicht nicht von ihm ausgeht, sondern von demjenigen, von welchem die Rede ist, d. h. in der Regel vom Subject des Hauptsatzes. Es ist nicht immer notwendig, dass der Sprecher diese Begründung als unzureichend verwirft, er will nur andeuten, dass sie nicht seinem Kopfe entsprungen sei; er verhält sich dieser Ansicht gegenüber skeptisch.*"

A still more recent attempt to explain the construction of Indirect Discourse along similar lines is that of Schlicher.<sup>1</sup> (The Mood of Indirect Quotation, A. J. P. 1905, XXVI, p. 87). It falls into the same confusion, and, I think, for similar reasons. His paper too, under the influence of the modern tendencies, begins with psychological terms. He finds a starting point in the construction of the repudiating question: *Non taces, insipiens? Taceam?* Bacch. 627.

It is difficult to sum up in a few words the idea of this very suggestive paper. The following sentence does it as well as any: the "subjunctive of indirect quotation reflects the status of a foreign idea in the mind of the speaker. It merely expresses his recognition of the presence of this idea in his mind and does not in any way vouch for the idea or include it in his own assertion", (p. 87). He begins with a psychological point of view, but before he ends, if one interprets his definition to fit the facts of Latin grammar, he arrives at an equivalent of the old view that the subjunctive is the mood of non-fact or at least of the "unvouched-for". Both definitions are of some use in treating Germanic Indirect Discourse. In fact, Schlicher is continually appealing to German for proofs. Neither definition, however, fits the facts of Latin grammar. Gutjahr-Probst (Beiträge, I, p. 71 ff.) furnishes another example of this tendency, and a great many of the school grammars; cf. e. g. Weissenfels' grammar (Weidmann, 1897), and Friedendorff's (Berlin, 1897).

The general impression caused by this irrepressible reappearance of the statement will be of course that there is some truth underlying all of it. An alternative, however, which I have suggested in the preceding may be true, namely, that the modern syntactician comes to the facts with his mind prejudiced by a daily intercourse with a language which shows facts apparently similar but after all essentially different, and that in the desire, in a way wholesomely scientific, of judging the phenomena of the past by the facts of the present, he misunderstands the subject of inquiry. Let us examine the latter possibility.

<sup>1</sup> See a fuller discussion of his paper in Class. Phil. Vol. I; p. 82, and p. 179-80. In a more recent paper (Class. Phil. Vol. II, pp. 79), he has attempted to explain the Latin subjunctive in consecutive clauses by the same method. His main reference of the latter to a simple subjunctive of "repudiation" assumes a psychological genetic force. However, behind the whole explanation there seems to loom the shadow of the Germanic optative in relative clauses that follow a negative.



It will be worth while to point out in greater detail just what is the essential difference in connotation between the Germanic construction of Indirect Discourse, so-called, and that of Latin in order the better to indicate the danger to which Latin Syntax is subjected through this constant misreading of Latin by German-trained eyes. The facts should be well known, but for all that they are seldom heeded.

In Latin, the subjunctive, whether in the subordinate clause of Indirect Discourse or Indirect Question, is, roughly speaking, an equivalent of quotation marks. It does not, in spite of all the above mentioned contentions, indicate "Zweifel, Ungewissheit, eine subjective Vorstellung". Every Latinist knows this, unless he happens to be supporting a different theory. If Behagel's definition were true for Latin we should not have the same construction following *scio*, *puto*, and *dico*, which differ so widely in respect to the amount of "Ungewissheit". We should find as in the old Germanic dialects that the mood shifted to indicate the degree of plausibility denoted by the leading word.

Nor does the subjunctive in Indirect Discourse indicate, as Dittmar would have it, repugnance, non-acceptance, skepticism, and the like. No array of proofs is needed where the facts are so obvious. In Latin one finds the subjunctive proportionately as often in quotations of unchallenged facts as of dubious reports. The indicative<sup>1</sup> occurs of course very freely, more freely than our manuals would have it do; but it does not burst forth simply to assure the reader that the quotation is entirely reliable; it occurs, rather, to notify the reader that the clause just obtruding is to be considered outside of the quotation marks.

Of course we must admit that even a quotation mark often indicates or suggests a suspicion of skepticism. Any clever stylist would take advantage of this inevitable implication and make the best of it, so that if one chooses, one may find examples in Latin too in which the subjunctive, through a trick of style, has been made to indicate refusal to endorse or vouch for a report. Such cases are sometimes found in so-called *Implied* Indirect Discourse and in quoted reasons with *quod* and *quia*: cf. Men. 397, *ire infitias mihi facta quae sunt?* MEN.: *dic quid est id quod negem*, "Tell me what this thing is that (you say that) I

<sup>1</sup> This, like all brief statements, is of course inadequate. But the details are well enough known. For a fuller treatment, though not full enough, see Lebreton: *La Langue de Cicéron*, pp. 365-372.

deny"; and Merc. 924, *mater iratast patri quia scortum sibi ob oculos adduxerit* in aedis. Eutychus, the speaker, knows that the "lady with the green eyes" is wrong in her suspicions. The subjunctive, therefore, not only shows that he is quoting her, but it betrays an implication that he does not intend to support her jealous charges. What I wish to say, however, is that in Latin this added implication of repudiation, skepticism, etc., is secondary when it occurs, and that it will necessarily occur at times whatever the construction of Oratio Obliqua may be. Secondly, the constructions of Implied Indirect Discourse, and of quoted reason are obviously of secondary origin in Latin and cannot be adduced in an argument regarding the origins of the Latin construction.

In the early Germanic dialects, the optative of Oratio Obliqua means quite a different thing. Erdmann (*Deutsche Syntax* I, p. 168) gives the following rule: Deutet er keinen Widerspruch oder Zweifel an der Tatsächlichkeit desselben an, so setzt er den Indicativ; will er dasselbe entweder seinerseits ausdrücklich als irrig oder zweifelhaft bezeichnen, oder sich jeder Andeutung eines eigenen Urteiles enthalten, so setzt er den Conjunctiv. See also Wunderlich: *Deutscher Satzbau*, I, 344 ("Zweiflung der Realität"), and Delbrück:<sup>1</sup> *Der Germanische Optativ im Satzgefüge* (op. cit., p. 221 ff.). A few details may well illustrate the definition. For these I shall rely first upon the usages of Old-Icelandic<sup>2</sup> which are very consistent and have not been vitiated by dependence upon Greek and Latin originals as have most of the Gothic, early German, and Anglo-Saxon texts. The optative of Indirect Discourse in the Old-Icelandic of the Edda is never merely the equivalent of quotation marks. Except where some outside influence (as of fixed phrases, and the like) is working to cross purposes, it always reveals the reporter's attitude of mind towards the statement as being that of one not vouching for the actuality of it. This distinction is made exceedingly clear by a comparison of the constructions found in the Edda after *hyggja*, "think"; *vita*, "know", and *segja*, "say". *Hyggja*, since it does not state facts as facts, does not once take the indicative; *vita*, "to know", conveying, as it does, exact knowledge, always takes the indicative, except in two instances where the knowledge

<sup>1</sup> I accept to a great extent the distinctions he makes regarding the uses of the moods, but I cannot agree with him in his acceptance of Behagel's derivation of the construction from an independent potential optative.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my study on "The Optative in the Edda, A. J. P. XXVII, 23-28".

is questioned; while *segja*, to say naturally uses both, since it reports falsehoods as well as facts. The distinction is easily made. The optative is used in the following instances: in making a false accusation, in promising to tell a falsehood, in reporting a marvelous tale obviously not believed, in giving a report poorly vouched for in contrast to one having better support, etc. The examples are quoted in A. J. P. Vol. XXVII, p. 23. In all other instances the indicative appears. This distinction holds true for all expressions of Indirect Discourse. The construction is evidently very unlike the Latin. Gothic shows the same general distinction with a stronger liking for the indicative, which is largely due<sup>1</sup> to the fact that it is translating a Greek *ὅτι* plus the indicative.

Practically the same results are reached by comparing the Anglo-Saxon<sup>2</sup> *wenan* (to think) which regularly takes the optative (the proportion of optative to indicative is ten to one), *witan* where the indicative is regular (1 : 10), and the words of saying which convey more or less certainty, as *cweðan*,<sup>3</sup> *cyðan*, *secgan*. In the Heliand<sup>4</sup> too, verbs of thought and supposition like *wānjan* and *huggian* are most regularly in the optative, *queðan* very often, *seggian* almost half of the time, while verbs of knowledge and perception regularly take the indicative.

<sup>1</sup> I cannot agree with Behagel who infers from the scarcity of the subjunctive in Gothic Indirect Discourse, that the construction was then in its incipency. Gebrauch der Zeitformen, p. 163, ff. There is irrefutable proof that Gothic does not show the earliest condition when it avoids the optative of Indirect Discourse. The unanimity of the other dialects in using the optative proves quite conclusively that the usage was regular before the separation of the tribes; and that separation certainly antedates Ulphilas by far. The different dialects would hardly have developed this construction independently with such unanimity. The usage in Ulphilas is obviously unreliable testimony in this case.

For the usages in Gothic see Schirmer: Der Optativ im Gotischem; Bernhardt: Der Gotische Optativ (Zs. f. D., Phil. VIII, p. 12); and Delbrück (op. cit., p. 221).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gorrell (in Publ. Mod. Lang. Ass. Vol. III.); Wülffing: Die Syntax bei Alfred II., p. 88 ff., etc., in which find bibliography.

<sup>3</sup> Some leading verbs are prone to break down the distinctions of function given above. They readily acquire a habit of constantly associating with the word into whose company they are most often thrown. For instance, *cweðan* shows a remarkable dislike for the indicative in Cura Pastoralis. The behavior of individual words deserves greater attention than it has been granted.

<sup>4</sup> Behagel (op. cit., p. 163) seems to misread the data of his own earlier work (Die Modi im Heliand, p. 31).

In general the distinction here found holds good for all verbs *sentienti et declarandi* in the older dialects, and must be accepted as virtually true for pre-Germanic. Now if the Latin construction were like that of early Germanic we should expect to find a preponderance of the indicative with *scio*, of the subjunctive with *puto*, and a division of both with *dico*, to suit the distinctions just laid down. Since this is not the case, the fact should not need repetition that there is a decided difference of function between the construction as found in Latin and as found in early Germanics. In fact the Latin one is truly one of *indirect quotation*, the Germanic, one of *unvouched-for quotation*. Latin grammar wrongly imposed its name upon the Germanic construction, and the German grammarians have repaid the compliment by misinterpreting the Latin construction.

This removal of misconceptions is absolutely necessary before fruitful work can be done in the solution of the genetic problems of the construction. A disregard of the fact that the construction differed very much in form in the various languages, and a blindness to the differences of function have invited a comparative treatment of the problem that is impossible. The comparative method is not justified here in so far as it assumes a common origin of the constructions, since all the facts indicate that *Modusverschiebung* was unknown in quoted discourse in the protoethnic period. Comparisons, therefore, like those made by Behagel and Schlicher cannot supply convincing proof. They may only suggest parallels and illustrations.

The genetic problems of the two languages being so essentially unlike, their solutions will probably differ. I wish to call attention to the problem as presented in Germanics. The favorite solution offered (cf. Erdmann, p. 168, Behagel, p. 164, Wunderlich I., p. 344) is by reference to an (assumed) independent potential optative.<sup>1</sup> The only difficulty with this theory is the non-existence of such optatives in free usage. The few idiomatic usages that may be found are obviously offshoots of more complex constructions. Cf. A. J. P. XXVII, p. 11. They are too metaphysical in nature to be primitive and early. I suspect that the ingenuous desire to solve every construction by reference to parataxis, and to get a solution which would seem to fit all the languages, suggested this explanation.

<sup>1</sup>So Erdmann, for example, would posit an independent usage of the optative as the base of "Ein Eilbote meldet *Regensburg sei genommen*", p. 168.

Another and somewhat older method than the one just discussed still reappears at times. It simply assumes that the optative and subjunctive as the moods of thought, naturally find their place in the construction of Indirect Discourse. This solution assumes an impossibly large extension of the basic concept that underlies the idioms,<sup>1</sup> and assumes moreover that this concept was the same throughout, whereas we have shown how greatly it varied.

The real path to the solution lies through a closer scrutiny of each and every idiom. The facts already presented contain the clew to the matter. We discovered that the subjunctive was found most regularly with verbs like believe, think, suppose *wähnen*, *glauben*, *meinen*, etc. There is no paratactic usage existence that will serve as a basis for these constructions. We do not find elsewhere that the idea of "belief" or "thought" calls for a subjunctive. I believe the answer lies in the earlier history of some of these governing words. The solution I would suggest is contained in the following considerations.

*Glauben* has a suggestive semantic history. Goth., *galaubjan*: *glauben*; O. N. *leyfa* = (1) permit; (2) praise; Ags. *gelyfan* and O. H. G., *gilouben* = believe.

Uhlenbeck compares the words of the root *\*leubh* = desire: Goth. *liufs*; Lat. *lubido*, *lubet*, and adds "die Grundbedeutung von *-laubjan* ist *guteissen*, *gerne haben*". In its primitive meaning, therefore, it must have governed a substantive clause of desire in the optative. This construction it has retained in its drift into the new semantic function.

*Wähnen* had a similar history. Goth. *wēnjan*, "expect", "hope", "suppose", "think"; O. N. *væna*, "hope", "expect", "assume as true"; O. S. *wānjan*, Ags. *wēnan*, "hope", "expect", "think"; O. H. G. *wānnen*, "hope", "imagine", "think"; cf. the noun *wahn*, "unfounded belief", Goth. *wēns*; O. S. *wān*; Ags. *wēn*, "hope", "expectation". This verb, too, has passed from one expressing hopeful expectation and desire to a verb *sentiendi*. In doing so it has retained its habit of governing a substantive clause in the optative which it must have acquired while in its primitive meaning.

The verb represented by Goth. *hugjan* "think", "believe", has had a similar history: O. N. *hyggja*, "think" (in Hóv. 98, and a few times in prose = "hope", A. J. P. XXVII, p. 26. Cf. *hæfe*

<sup>1</sup> See Morris: Aims and Methods, *passim*.



*i hug* = "intend"), O. S. *huggian*, Ags. *hycgan*, "intend", "take thought of" "think", O. H. G. *hukkan* "intend" "have in mind", "think", "der Grundbedeutung von Goth. *hugs* ist 'geistige erregung'", Uhlenbeck. In shifting from its more primitive function of expressing intention, this verb too retained its substantive optative clause. In all such instances, *semantic changes in the governing verb involved coordinate semantic changes in its dependent clause*. As the governing verbs drift from expressions of desire, etc., to expressions of thinking, their dependent clauses while retaining their form and mood must have drifted in meaning from substantive clauses of desire to clauses of indirect thought.

The process here assumed is by no means rare. Numerous illustrations may be cited. E. g. the verb *fruor* when in its primitive meaning, "get fruit from", took the ablative (a true ablative or an instrumental). Its meaning gradually changed to that of "enjoy"; but it still retained its habit of governing an ablative. Again, *constare* "cost" in its primitive meaning naturally governed an ablative of means. In its later mercantile sense, the primitive meaning was probably not consciously felt although the word continued to employ the ablative. Now it must be very evident that the function of the ablative changed with the semantic changes of *fruor* and *constare*. These ablatives are no longer ablatives of means, instrument, etc. They are now "ablatives of cost", "enjoyment", and the like. Just so I conceive of a development of a quoted substantive clause in the optative caused by the semantic changes in the governing verbs.

Now to proceed with our argument, we have already seen that the verbs discussed above (*hyggia*, etc.) are the very verbs that are most consistent and persist the longest in the use of the optative. Verbs *sentiendi* of similar meaning acquired the optative habit from these as soon as the secondary usage was established. Such are, e. g. *gatraua*, *ahjan*, etc. in Gothic; *ælla*, *geta*, etc. in Old-Norse; *pencan*, *þyncan*, etc. in Anglo-Saxon, and so on. Of verbs *declarandi*, *qiþa* + optative is frequent in Gothic; in the Heliand *queðan* almost invariably takes the optative, and in Anglo-Saxon *cweðan* is the favorite of the optative. Verbs expressing perception and knowledge are the least prone to use an optative.

The mood of the so-called Oratio Obliqua in Germanics is thus explained. The peculiar tone of the construction as it appears in Germanics is accounted for by the same facts. Since

verbs of belief and thought, in which exact knowledge and perception is least predominant, were because of their primitive meanings the first and most persistent in the use of optative clauses, the inference became obvious that the optative belonged to expressions of less certainty, and the indicative by contrast to expressions of greater certainty. This rule<sup>1</sup> had become pretty well established in pre-Germanic usage.

It is the peculiar behavior of the modes in the Germanic construction of Indirect Discourse that has, I believe, done more than anything else to convince the modern grammarians that in general the modal distinction is a metaphysical one. I have shown how it came into being there. However there are other constructions also in which Germanic syntax reveals at least a tendency to establish such a distinction: e. g. relative clauses after a negative antecedent (cf. *láp engi mann eptir sitja es benlogom bregða kunne* [A. J. P. XXVII, p. 31], "Let no man sit idle who knows how to use the flaming sword"), relative clauses after comparatives (*betra es óþeþet an sé ofblótet*, "better is no praying than [is] too much offering", [A. J. P. XXVII, p. 19]). The same paper will furnish characteristic examples of the rest as well, relative clauses after superlatives, many adverbial and substantive clauses depending upon leading verbs that express uncertainty, the extensive use of assimilation, (A. J. P. XXVII p. 32), etc. I believe that the German grammarian is decidedly wrong when he explains such constructions as *originally due* to an underlying conception of "Unwirklichkeit, Zweifel, Subjectivität", for individually these constructions will ultimately prove solvable by

<sup>1</sup> I do not mean to say that this rule was ever consistently established throughout Germanics, for the different verbs often established laws unto themselves. Some verbs like *hyggja* in Old-Norse, clung persistently to their primitive use of the optative in spite of occasionally functioning in expressions of fairly definite facts. Sometimes too by mutual division of labor, synonymous verbs would adopt contrasting usages, cf. *cweðan* versus *cyðan* in Anglo-Saxon. Such forces are numerous and must not be ignored in the attempt to establish consistent rules. Some similar process may have helped to create the subjunctive construction of Latin which shows itself in clauses depending upon infinitives of *Oratio Obliqua*. However, in Latin the earlier processes are much obscured by the later thorough-going superimposition of the infinitival usage. At any rate I am not at liberty to discuss that problem at present. Mr. Hale has a different theory, as yet unpublished, which would seem to explain many of the facts of the Latin usage. By his permission I referred to it in a previous work (*Attraction of Mood in Early Latin*, p. 11), and shall content myself at present by simply citing that reference.

reference to a very definite semantic process of the kind that we have found above in the case of Indirect Discourse. I do not even believe that in later times the all-comprehensive metaphysical distinction so persistently laid down by Erdmann, Wunderlich, Delbrück, etc. will hold true for any given period, since, as we have seen, individual constructions always asserted a marked tendency to pursue a free course of development independent of whatever overshadowing general conceptions may have existed. It is enough to admit that Germanic modal usages drifted farther in the direction of such distinctions than any other, and that for this reason it is very unsafe to interpret the facts of Latin, Greek, etc. in the light of Germanics.

In conclusion I would briefly suggest some auxiliary causes for this drift of the Germanic optative. There is a general conviction that Latin and Germanic possess a syncretism of the optative and the subjunctive, and that Latin retained the subjunctive as the predominant element while Germanics retained more of the optative. It is but reasonable that the functions of the resulting moods should vary with the predominance of forms retained. This fact will do something to account for the difference we have noted. We know from the behavior of the optative in Sanskrit and Greek that it lent itself more extensively than the subjunctive to the expression of certain objective conceptions. It is there largely the mood of the hypothetical idioms, of "irrealis", of the preterite future, and at times seemingly of possibility. Modal forms are after all not quick to slough off inveterate functions. When the forms that had these meanings well ingrained came to constitute a large part of the anti-indicative mood in Germanics, the contrast of such fictive functions to the factitive of the indicative may have become conscious, at least to an extent of helping to acclimatize any new construction that raised such distinctions.

Again, I have already suggested that the essential temperament of a nation may reasonably reveal itself in the general drift of syntactical usage. Syntax, having to do mainly with psychology, can find few rules for its phenomena. A study of the mental characteristics of nations may give but slight indication of such laws, but even these would be welcome. The difference between the Latin and Germanic usages which we have noticed in this paper are in accord with what we should expect, judging by the mental temperaments of the peoples. As for the creation of metaphysical distinctions of mood in Latin, the

peculiar history of the modal construction about the time of Plautus quite precludes the possibility.

I refer to the remarkable invasion of the regular indicative field by the subjunctive. The latter mood was freely expressing factitive relations in Indirect Discourse and in result clauses before Plautus. It soon extended this usage throughout characterizing clauses, *cum*-temporal, and causal clauses, iterative and generalizing clauses of all kinds, clauses after *quamquam*, after *priusquam*, etc., until in silver Latin, it had acquired as vigorous a habit of narrating facts as the indicative possessed. After such a history, the Latin subjunctive must have been very far from suggesting conceptions like *Unwirklichkeit*, *Zweifel*. Before Plautus some of its idioms may possibly have taken the course revealed by Germanics. After Livy the possibility is hardly conceivable.

TENNEY FRANK.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

### III.—THE CHRONOLOGY OF OVID'S EARLY WORKS.

Perhaps the most important source for determining the order in which Ovid's early works appeared is the eighteenth poem of Book II of his *Amores*. A growing doubt as to whether this poem has ever been correctly interpreted, leads me to consider, in a summary fashion, the general question of the chronology of Ovid's early works. Not pausing to examine Ovid's vague references to a poem on the *Gigantomachia*, which, if written at all, was a product of his extreme youth, we may centre our attention on the *carmina amatoria*.

From a remark in the poet's brief autobiography (*Tristia*, 4, 10, 57), it is clear that his poems on *Corinna*—the *Amores*, therefore—are his earliest work. But turning to one of the *Amores* (2, 18) we find Ovid telling his friend *Macer* that he is at present employed either in "professing the arts of gentle love" or in writing *Heroides*. He mentions also his previous contribution to tragedy. I cite the lines which concern our present problem from the text of *Merkel-Ehwald*.

Sceptra tamen sumpsi, curaque tragoedia nostra  
Crevit et huic operi quamlibet aptus eram.

\* \* \* \*

Quod licet, aut artes teneri profitemur Amoris,  
(Ei mihi! praeceptis urgeor ipse meis)  
Aut, quod Penelopes verbis reddatur Ulixi,  
Scribimus et lacrimas, Phylli relictæ, tuas,  
Quod Paris et Macareus et quod male gratus Iaso  
Hippolytique parens Hippolytusque legant,  
Quodque tenens strictum Dido miserabilis ensem  
Dicat et Aoniae Lesbis † amata lyrae.

The solution of the main difficulty to which the above passage gives rise has long been known: as Ovid tells us in the quatrain prefixed to the *Amores* that there were two editions of the work, the first in five, the second in three books, we can assume still that his earliest publication was the *Amores*, in five books; we see also, from the letter to *Macer*, that after writing *Amores*, Ovid felt a higher call and turned to tragedy,<sup>1</sup> that this work was

<sup>1</sup> See also *Amores* 3, 15.



followed by the *Heroides* and further love-poems of the kind he had written first, and that these—among them, of course, 2, 18—with whatever poems of the first edition he chose to preserve, were gathered into a second edition of *Amores*, in three books.

The second edition, I think we may safely infer, followed the final publication of the *Heroides*. For although Ovid apparently speaks of himself as still at work on these latter poems (*scribimus*)<sup>1</sup> he mentions as many as nine of the fifteen that we know, in the order 1, 2, 5, 11, 6, 10, 4, 7, 15. I agree emphatically with Jacoby, who, in his important article on the Roman elegy,<sup>2</sup> infers that in mentioning the letter of Penelope first and that of Sappho last, Ovid is describing a collection identical with that which we possess. Ovid does not mention all the pieces and he does not adhere to the order observed in our present collection, but then, he was writing poetry and not a library catalogue. Moreover, he goes on to tell of the answers to the heroines' missives written in short order by his friend Sabinus. "How soon", he says, "did my Sabinus return from belting the globe, and bring back despatches from places far apart!"

Quam cito de toto rediit meus orbe Sabinus  
Scriptaque diversis rettulit ille locis!

This looks, certainly, as if Ovid had published a collection before Sabinus started his answers; as Ovid pictures him, he goes at full speed with his missives from hero to hero, returning with a bagful of replies. Finally, the list of these letters begins with one to Penelope and ends with one to Sappho—the first and the last, once more, in our present collection. Only six answers are mentioned, in the order 1, 4, 7, 2, 6, 15, but that suffices Ovid's purpose. It may well be, then, that Ovid had finished his first series of *Heroides* only a short time, a month, let us say, before writing the present epistle to Macer. Sabinus had dashed off his answers in a fortnight or so—rapidly enough, at any rate, to cause even the facile Ovid astonishment—and the whole affair is so fresh in Ovid's mind that he naturally uses the present tense.

There is a simpler, and I think, better explanation of the present *scribimus*. It refers not to the exact time when the poet

<sup>1</sup> Schanz, *Gesch. der röm. Litteratur* § 293 sees only this meaning in the word.

<sup>2</sup> *Rhein. Mus.* LX (1905), p. 71. Jacoby's main thesis, it seems to me, though plausibly presented, is by no means proved.

is engaged on a certain work, but to what in general the subjects are that at present attract him. Thus the opening lines to his friend

Carmen ad iratum dum tu perducis Achillen  
Primaque iuratis induis arma viris

mean not that Macer has not yet finished his *Antehomerica*, but that he is an epic poet. Ovid, in contrast, is a poet who sings of love or writes letters for desolate heroines. The present tenses are generally, not specifically, present. *Scribimus* applies to a period in Ovid's career, not to the exact moment when he sent this letter to his friend. One sharply marked contrast in time is evident, the contrast between Ovid's present occupation and the days when he wrote his tragedy (*sumpsi . . . crevit . . . eram*)—the days when he, too, attempted the higher style. One period is set off against the other. But Ovid could apply the present tense to any one of several distinct works appearing in the latter period. The *Heroides*, therefore, may have been completed and given to the world not merely a month, but a year or more before the letter to Macer was written.

This explanation of Ovid's use of the present tense, though made most probable, I believe, by the above considerations, is established with certainty by the evidence of a later letter to Macer, the beautiful and pathetic poem sent by the exiled Ovid to his friend (*Ex Pont.*, 2, 10). Here Ovid, revealing for once a sincere and poignant grief, speaks of the *communia sacra* of poets, and of the wiser use his friend had made of poetry (l. 11);

Studiis quibus es quam nos sapientius usus.

For his theme is not love, but rather

Tu canis aeterno quidquid restabat Homero  
Ne careant summa Troica bella manu.  
Naso parum prudens, artem dum tradit amanti,  
Doctrinae pretium triste magister habet.

Certainly Ovid does not mean that his brother-poet, some twenty-five years after the earlier letter, is still toiling patiently on the *Antehomerica*, or that he himself, amid the terrors of Siberia, is composing appeals to the *ianitor*, and instructing Corinna in the art of assignation. He does not mean either, to refer by contrast to past achievements: were this his intention, he would have used past tenses. He refers generally to the varieties of poetry for which he and his friend are and have been known. Finally, the model for both of these letters of Ovid is a poem of

Propertius (1, 7) addressed to his friend Ponticus, like Macer, a writer of epic.

Dum tibi Cadmeae dicuntur, Pontice, Thebae  
Armaque fraternae tristia militiae,  
Atque, ita sim felix, primo contendis Homero,

\* \* \* \*

Nos, ut consuemus, nostros agitamus amores.

It does not concern us to inquire how many elegies Propertius had finished when he wrote these words. He wrote others later, and doubtless Ovid's collection of *Amores* was not complete when he sent his earlier letter to Macer. But the *Heroides*, despite the present tense, might have been finished at that time, just as the *Amores* and the *Art of Love* were, when he wrote Macer again at the close of his life. In both poems the intention is not to fix a definite date, but to associate the writer's name with a definite variety of poetry—in the words of Propertius (l. 10),

Hic mihi conteritur vitae modus, haec mea fama est,  
Hinc cupio nomen carminis ire mei.

If we may accept, then, the fact that the *Heroides* were already published when Ovid wrote his first letter to Macer, the chronological order of the works thus far discussed must be as follows: *Amores* (first edition), *Medea*, *Heroides*, *Amores* (second edition)<sup>1</sup>.

It would be natural, further, to suppose that this series of works antedated the didactic poems—*De Medicamine Faciei*, *Ars Amatoria*, *Remedia Amoris*—were it not for a statement in the letter to Macer which has already, doubtless, attracted the reader's attention. Ovid declares not only that he has been writing *Heroides* but also that he is "professing the arts of gentle love". Schanz repeats (§ 293) what I think has been the universal opinion from the humanists to the latest editor of the *Amores*, that Ovid here refers to his didactic masterpiece, the *Ars Amatoria*. Herewith, new complexities are introduced. If we may argue, as I have just done for the *Heroides*, that the

<sup>1</sup> Tolkiehn, in a recent note (*Wochenschrift f. klass. Philol.* 1906, p. 1208 ff.) is inclined to the belief, for which he adduces no new evidence, that the *Heroides* preceded the *Medea* and even the *Corinna* poems. I am confident that this idea, which Riese, too, held (I p. ix of his edition, 1871), may be easily refuted from what we have already found in Ovid's earlier letter to Macer. Riese's appeal to the order of the poems in the Parisinus is irrelevant, for of course the *Heroides* should precede, in a chronological arrangement, the *final* edition of the *Amores* in three books.

work was already completed, the second edition of *Amores* must have followed the *Ars Amatoria*, and, of course, the *De Medicina Faciei*, to which Ovid refers in the latter work (A. A. 3, 205). This would put the date of the final edition of the *Amores* very late, since certain historical allusions indubitably place the *Art of Love* between 1 B. C. and 1 A. D. The *Amores* were begun, we may infer with Schanz (§ 293), about 22 B. C. The earliest date alluded to in any of the poems in our collection is 19 B. C., the latest is 15 B. C.; beyond these facts we have no certain evidence as to the date of either edition.<sup>1</sup> Supposing the first edition appeared as late, even, as 15 B. C.,—we can hardly suppose that Ovid spent *more* than eight years on his earliest work—there would intervene between the two editions what impresses me as the incredibly lengthy period of fourteen or fifteen years. Judging merely by Ovid's lively temperament, his facility at writing verse, or, as he puts it, his inability to write prose, I should be inclined to date the first edition early, about 19 or 18 B. C., including in the second edition *Amores* 1, 14, which alludes to the date 15 B. C.

This dating, of course would make it still less possible to place the second edition after the *Art of Love*. Full eighteen years would intervene between the two editions—and Ovid certainly is no adviser of the *twice* "nine years pondered lay". He was temperamentally averse to revising. He left his greatest work, the *Metamorphoses*, unrevised, preferring to begin a new poem, the *Fasti*. This was half-finished when his exile was declared; he did revise it later, hoping that the poem, with its new dedication to Germanicus, might effect his recall. Here emendation had a purpose. The revision of the *Amores* consisted in the addition of certain subsequent pieces, and the exclusion of two-fifths of the original poems. As with much of the verse written during his exile, he gave them, to use his phrase, to the "emending flames". That was his method; not like Virgil

"to write ten lines, they say,  
At dawn, and lavish all the golden day  
To make them wealthier in his reader's eyes,"

but rather to throw away and begin again—begin something else.

<sup>1</sup> In a forthcoming article in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* (XVIII p. 64) entitled *The Medea of Seneca*, Dr. H. L. Cleasby states his belief that Ovid's *Medea* preceded Horace's *Art of Poetry*. If his conclusions can be substantiated, we can place the first edition of *Amores* at least before 14 B. C.

I think, therefore, that after Ovid returned from his excursion into tragedy, after he had finished his *Heroides* and written a few more love-elegies, he would not have waited long before bringing out his second and final edition of *Amores*. Assuming, as I have done, 18 B. C. or thereabouts as the date of the first edition, and allowing two or three years for tragedy, a like number for *Heroides*, and a year for new *Amores*—a liberal allowance, I am convinced—we should arrive at no later date than 11 B. C. for the second edition of the *Amores*. But what, the reader may ask again, is to be done with the mention of the Art of Love in Ovid's letter to Macer?

Jacoby, in the essay above-mentioned, declares for the latest possible date for the second edition of the *Amores*. On the strength of the allusion in 2, 18, he is willing to place the second edition not only after the *Ars Amatoria* but after the *Remedia*. It would therefore immediately precede Ovid's final masterpiece, the *Metamorphoses*, which is, therefore, the *area maior* mentioned by the poet in his epilogue (*Am.* 3, 15). *Per correr miglior acqua*, the poet leaves behind him not merely his ditties in praise of the imaginary Corinna, but his tragedy, his *heroides*, his art of cosmetics, his art of love and his remedies for the same.

Pulsandast magnis area maior equis.

Unfortunately for this theory, the lines preceding these words deserve attention; they contain proof conclusive of the usual opinion that this poem is the epilogue to the first edition of the *Amores*. Ovid first bids Venus and her boy farewell:

Culte puer puerique parens Amathusia culti  
Aurea de campo vellite signa meo!

Then he declares who the new master is that calls him to a wider field:

Corniger increpuit thyrso graviore Lyaeus  
Pulsandast magnis area maior equis.

Venus at last yields the palm to Liber, who presides over tragedy and not the metamorphosis. Ovid had sketched another picture of the same contest in which the same combatants appeared with other names—Elegy and Tragedy (*Am.* 3, 1). Not inappropriately, Tragedy there used the very phrase applied to Bacchus here (l. 23 f.):

Tempus erat thyrso pulsum graviore moveri;  
Cessatum satis est: incipe maius opus.

In short, the poems which Ovid has placed at the beginning and end of his third book are companion-pieces. As often in Ovid,



who was born with a genius for metamorphosis, they present the opposite sides of an issue. Ovid delights in assuming contradictory attitudes, stating either case with perfect seriousness and conviction. The supreme illustration—it is by no means the only one—is the antinomy between his art of love for the gallant, his art of love for the mistress, and his remedies of love for them both. The present poems differ from these later *artes* only in setting forth a real and personal issue.

I have reasoned thus far as if inference were our only guide. But if we may trust the *textus receptus* of an important passage, Ovid himself has settled the question for us, by direct statement. Among the books which he recommends for his mistress's library (A. A. 3, 343), he appropriately includes his own *Amores*, referring explicitly to the edition in three books:

Deve tribus libris, titulo quos signat Amorum.

This statement we should accept as proof that the final edition of the *Amores* preceded the *Art of Love*, were there not the possibility of a corruption in the text of the line just cited. The only early MS of the third book of the *Art of Love*, the Parisinus of the ninth century<sup>1</sup> has not *Deve tribus* but the unintelligible *Dece cerem* (corr. *Deie*). Recent editors have conjectured *deve puer* or *decerpens* or other neat phrases which we need not discuss. Now *Deve tribus* is not a similar correction by some early editor, but, with *Deque* as occasional variant, it is the reading of fifteenth century MSS before the printed text appeared, as a glance at Jahn's edition shows; I may add that the reading is found in a Harvard MS (Lo 10, 100). Those who, with Jacoby, regard it as *eine ganz unwahrscheinliche Konjektur* (op. cit., p. 71) must admit, at least, that it antedates the editions. The whole line in the Paris MS has been badly shaken up in transmission. Editors do not hesitate to reject its meaningless reading *titulos quo* either for *titulus quos*, found in the late MSS and adopted by Jahn and others, or for *titulo quos* conjectured rightly, I believe, by Ehwald and confirmed by the Harvard MS. I think we may quite as safely regard the fifteenth century MSS as giving in *Deve (Deque) tribus libris* not a later emendation, but a genuine tradition from the archetype; the reading of the Paris MS is certainly involved in monstrous and inexplicable error, but there are other mon-

<sup>1</sup>Chatelain, *Paléographie des Classiques Latins*, gives the date correctly, as the facsimile on Pl. XCIII shows; it is not tenth century, as Merkel-Ehwald and others state.

strosities in this MS. In short, while wishing at first to argue the case without the support of the present passage, I appeal to it now, hoping, too, that my previous reasoning may help to corroborate the *textus receptus*. Two lines of evidence, therefore, lead to the conclusion that the second edition of the Amores preceded the Art of Love, and therefore the mention of *artes amoris* in the letter to Macer, cannot mean that the latter poem was already completed. According to Jacoby (loc. cit.), the statement in the letter becomes, therewith, unintelligible.

However, two possible interpretations of the passage remain. The one is that Ovid had merely begun his Art of Love at the moment of his writing to Macer. This explanation has satisfied everybody, so far as I can find out, except Jacoby. We may agree that although the historical references in the Art of Love locate it definitely between 1 B. C. and 1 A. D., Ovid may have busied himself with the plan of the poem before this time—*schon länger vorher*, Schanz says, and is inclined to regard the passages in question as later additions made when the book was published. But the supposition of later additions puts us at once on dangerous ground. I propose, therefore, giving up the ordinary explanation, to interpret the passage in the letter to Macer in the only way now remaining—that is, as not referring to the Art of Love at all.

Ovid's Amores have been subjected to severe criticism by those who expect to find there the passion of Catullus or the tender sentimentality of Tibullus. *Leblosigkeit, Rhetorik, Lüsternheit* are the qualities that Jacoby emphasizes—in a word, conventional lewdness. He accordingly refuses Ovid a place among the *wirkliche Dichter* in Roman elegy.<sup>1</sup> But those who know something of Ovid the wit will not fail to detect in these poems, besides Ovid's usual delight in sheer narration and clever phrase-making, a delicate travesty on the love-elegy itself. Horace had given him the hint, in such a poem as his eleventh Epode, and Ovid, revelling in the conception, works it out at length. Indecent he is, to the point of blasphemy, and interested profoundly in intrigue, but what in an emotional poet, like Tibullus, would become morbid or prurient is kept sane by Ovid's incorrigible wit. The lyric impulse would be singularly out of place in a work of this kind, granting that the poet possessed it. His purpose is not to

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., pp. 79, 97, 98. It is a pity that Jacoby's other characterizations are not so apt as that in the note on p. 98, where he seeks to temper Schanz's terrific indictment of the morality of the Amores.

unbosom what Schanz (§ 294) so sorely misses in the *Amores*—“*des Herzens auf- und abwogende Stimmungen*,” it is to observe the lover and all his ways in life and in the elegy with the subconscious purpose of making his sentimentality ridiculous. There is no room for soulfulness in such a program. One might as well deplore the lack of Puritanic religious intensity in Butler's *Hudibras*.

Now love-elegy of such a type as this, is, like all satire, essentially didactic. The poet's purpose is not to transcribe sensations, but to observe. Many critics have noticed this element in the *Amores*; it is amply illustrated by Schanz (§ 294). Ovid already is aware that his subject is the art of love: he shows this not only by his choice of themes and his manner of treating them, but by explicit avowal. I mean that the present lines refer not to his later poem, but to his *Amores*.

Quod licet, aut artes teneri profiteamur Amoris,  
(Ei mihi, praeceptis urgeor ipse meis).

This is the same art that he has been professing all along. Perhaps in 1, 10, 59 f.—

Est quoque carminibus meritas celebrare puellas  
Dos mea; quam volui, nota fit arte mea—

he is thinking rather of the art of poetry, but another passage (2, 19, 34) echoes the meaning of the lines to Macer—

Ei mihi! ne monitis torquear ipse meis!

But apart from these and other expressions, a single passage in Tibullus suffices to prove my point. Tibullus remarks of his faithless mistress (1, 6, 9),

Ipse miser docui quo posset ludere pacto  
Custodes; heu, heu, nunc premor arte mea.

Even before Ovid, then, the elegy had a tendency to the didactic, as its growing conventionality would lead us to expect.<sup>1</sup> Ovid furthered this tendency by adding the element of travesty, and, finally, in the master-piece of his early period, metamorphosed the love-elegy into didactic poetry—mock-didactic—out and out. But he could appropriately refer to his *Amores*, too, as presenting, in detachments, an art of love, and that, I am convinced, is his meaning here.

I may now sum up categorically the inferences I have drawn in interpreting anew the letter to Macer. In this letter, Ovid in-

<sup>1</sup> A point well developed by Jacoby, *op. cit.*, p. 48, n. 3.

forms his friend that while the latter is an epic bard, for himself, he can sing of nothing but love, though there was a time when he essayed a tragedy with tolerable success. His present works are two—*Amores* and *Heroides*. The former had already appeared in an edition of five books, sometime later to be reedited, with the addition of the letter to Macer and, doubtless, other pieces, in three books. The *Heroides* he had completed, possibly a very short time before. We cannot infer that he had begun or planned his *Art of Love*. We may set 11 B. C. as a date later than which it is not probable that the second edition of *Amores* appeared. That leaves us still a long stretch before the publication of his next work, the *De Medicamine Faciei*. We know merely that this preceded the *Art of Love* and that the latter work and the *Remedia* were published between 1 B. C. and 1 A. D. I do not deny that Ovid may have planned his *Art of Love* and even written parts of it several years before. I certainly would not maintain that he could not have had several works in progress at the same time. But I do not think it was in his nature to brood long over his creations, or to subject them to the file. Rather, he would toss them off lightly, retaining but not revising whatever pleased him, throwing away whatever did not. If I am right in this inference, it is more natural to place both the inception and the completion of the *Art of Love* as near as possible to the date when we know the poem was published. If it were begun in 2 B. C., Ovid could easily have finished it in the time thus allowed. Between 11 and 2 B. C. the *De Medicamine Faciei* was written, but at just what point it is impossible to say. Ovid may well have been occupied with some of those works which are no longer extant; Bürger, in his dissertation *De Ovidi carminum amatoriorum inventione et arte*, 1901, p. 47, suggests what these may have been. Those few who believe that the double letters among the *Heroides* (XVI–XXI) are Ovid's, may perhaps wish to add them to this list. A forthcoming Harvard dissertation will seek to establish the genuineness of these poems, and to determine, so far as this is possible, their date. Granted that they are Ovid's, they may perhaps have been written at some later period. But even supposing this possibility, and admitting the fact that other undertakings would not fill the interval between the second edition of *Amores* and the *De Medicamine Faciei*, it is not necessary to assume that Ovid was intensely busy during all periods of his career.

#### IV.—THE DATE OF CICERO'S CATO MAIOR DE SENECTUTE.

It is generally agreed that Cicero's Cato Maior was written either shortly before or within two months after the death of Caesar.

For each view there is both internal and external evidence, or rather, perhaps, certain pieces of evidence have been interpreted in favor of each, several indeed in favor of both.

Maurer in 1884 (Fleck-Jahrb. 129. 386.) gave certain convincing arguments in favor of the earlier date, and Mr. F. G. Moore in the introduction to his edition of the Cato Maior, published in 1903, sums up briefly most of the arguments on both sides, and decides unhesitatingly in favor of that date. To his evidence on this side of the question it may not be amiss to add a couple of suggestions along the same lines.

For one of the most telling points hitherto made, the argument starts from the Cato Maior itself, sec. 2: *et tamen te suspicor eisdem rebus quibus me ipsum interdum gravius commoveri. Quarum consolatio et maior est et in aliud tempus differenda; nunc autem visum est mihi de senectute aliquid ad te scribere.* Everyone agrees that the troubles here alluded to, troubles for which consolation is more difficult than for old age, are political troubles of some sort. Those who favor the earlier date of composition interpret them as the conditions existing in the state under Caesar, the advocates of the later date as the conditions under Antony after Caesar's death. For these troubles, whichever they were, Cicero hereby suggests that he may in future attempt to write a *consolatio*, as he is now writing a *consolatio* for old age. Whatever these political troubles were, then, they were of a nature to admit of consolation, and indeed of such consolation as might be presented in a formal literary treatise, based on philosophical studies.

What consolations of this sort might Cicero have found for the troubles of each of these periods? In regard to the earlier period we have a statement of his own, de Div. 2, 6, quoted by Mr. Maurer and Mr. Moore, and showing clearly that he had in mind



a definite line of consolation, drawn from philosophy, for the tyranny of Caesar at Rome, the fact that a one-man power might be regarded as only a normal step in the political development of the state: id enim ipsum a Platone philosophiaque didiceram naturales esse quasdam conversiones rerum publicarum, ut eae tum a principibus tenerentur, tum a populis, aliquando a singulis. Quod cum accidisset nostrae rei publicae, etc. This evidence, however, will amount to proof only if it can be shown that in the period following Caesar's death Cicero did not see or could not have seen the same possibilities of consolation for the evils then existing.

The evidence here must be looked for in Cicero's letters written between March 15th and May 11th, though probably no one would put the Cato Maior later than May 1st, even though no mention is made of it before the 11th.

The earliest of these letters (ad Fam. 6. 15), probably written on the very day of Caesar's murder, is full of exultation. In these first days of supposed liberation from tyranny, Cicero was in a mood to write a panegyric rather than a consolation for the times. There are no more letters extant till April 7th. From this date on, they come in quick succession, and they betray a constant state of doubt, and of anxiety amounting at times almost to despair, until May 1st, when Dolabella's attitude in Antony's absence gives some hope of better times. In none of these letters does there seem to be a hint of the resignation and calmness such as must have been felt, to a certain degree at least, by one who contemplates writing a *consolatio* for the evils amidst which he lives. Indeed, the conditions, varying from day to day, entirely uncertain as to final outcome, must hardly have admitted of resignation or consolation even to one of less mercurial temperament than Cicero. One can hardly feel resigned to or consoled for evils the true nature of which is not yet evident.

In only one letter, ad Att. 14, 13, 3, is there a reference to literature as a solace. This is in looking forward to future evils; nos autem id videamus \* \* \* ut quicquid acciderit, fortiter et sapienter feramus \* \* \* nosque cum multum litterae tum non minimum idus quoque Martiae consolentur. And even here it is not from literature, but from the "ides of March", that comfort is chiefly drawn. The "ides of March", indeed, are more than once mentioned as affording consolation (ad Att. 14, 4; 14, 6; 14, 12). But this is not the sort of consolation to be embodied in a philosophical treatise, and even this feeling of pleasure in sated hatred

fails, at times, to console, for more than once Cicero exclaims that though the tyrant is dead, tyranny still lives: *verum illis* (the liberators) *magna consolatio conscientia maximi et clarissimi facti, nobis quae consolatio, qui, interfecto rege, liberi non sumus?* ad Att. 14, 11, April 21. Cp. ad Att. 14, 5; 14, 9; 14, 10; 14, 14.

From the last letter here cited, moreover, it is evident that Atticus had been trying to induce Cicero to take a more cheerful view of things, and from the whole tone of this reply of Cicero's it may be gathered that its writer was in no frame of mind even to receive consolation gracefully, to say nothing of offering it to others.

Briefly then, in the months just preceding the ides of March Cicero seems to have actually found in philosophy grounds of consolation for Caesar's tyranny; after the ides of March he was at first too jubilant, later too depressed, too anxious and uncertain, to feel at the one time the necessity, at the other the possibility, of consolation.

The most important argument, however, is based on external evidence, certain passages in the second book of the *de Divinatione*. Cicero gives in the introduction to this book a list of his philosophical and rhetorical works. He clearly includes in the list the first book of the *de Divinatione*, when he says (3): *quae ut plene esset cumulateque perfecta 'de Divinatione' ingressi sumus his libris scribere*. He also includes the *Cato Maior*: *interiectus est etiam nuper liber is quem ad Atticum de senectute misimus*.

As everyone now recognizes, in this second book *de Divinatione* is indicated the change in Cicero's plans, caused by the death of Caesar, and the immediate, though short-lived, hope that he would again become an active factor in political life (sec. 7): *quod cum accidisset nostrae rei publicae* (its domination by a tyrant) *tum, pristinis orbatu muneribus haec studia renovare coepimus \* \* \** *Nunc quoniam de re publica consuli coepti sumus tribuenda est opera rei publicae \* \* \** *tantum huic studio relinquendum quantum vacabit a publico officio et munere*. The line of argument usually deduced from these passages is as follows: As this statement in 2, 7. is not made at the beginning of the first book, it is fair to assume that that was finished before Caesar's death. And if so, the expression *interiectus est etiam nuper* of the *Cato Maior* would most naturally mean that that work, too, was written before the death of Caesar, either just before, or during, or just after the writing of the first book *de Divinatione*.

This is true, so far as it goes. But it should be noted that these very passages have been used also as the basis of argument by those who have advocated the later date. Is it not rather on another sentence than *interiectus est* that the main stress should be laid? After this mention of the Cato Maior, Cicero adds a few more works to the list, and then goes on (sec. 4): *adhuc haec erant. Ad reliqua alacri tendebamus animo, sic parati, ut, nisi quae causa gravior obstitisset, nullum philosophiae locum esse pateremur qui non Latinis litteris illustratus pateret.* We know from sec. 7 that Cicero considered that his literary work had been seriously interrupted by the death of Caesar, in that this event involved him, as he supposed, once more in political life. May not the words *causa gravior*, then, be explained in the light of sec. 7 as referring definitely to the death of Caesar and its effect on Cicero?

There may be question as to the details of translation in this passage, but the general import of it is: the series of Cicero's philosophical works had been carried to the point indicated, including the works named, at a given time. He was going on eagerly to complete the series unless some serious obstacle had prevented. Even if *nisi quae causa gravior obstitisset* must be interpreted as a future condition from a past standpoint, it is reasonable to suppose that in introducing these words Cicero had in mind the same obstacle to which he alludes explicitly in sec. 7; that interruption which, however we interpret *causa gravior*, did actually occur before the writing of both these passages. This interruption is hinted at in *causa gravior* (4), explained as the death of Caesar in *nunc \* \* \* rei publicae* (7), and in (4) the *adhuc haec erant* following the list of Cicero's works sums up the works written before the interruption in contrast to what may in the future be done, as in (7) *haec studia \* \* \* coepimus*, and *philosophiam \* \* \* putabamus* allude to works written before Caesar's death in contrast to the uncertainties of future literary work implied in *nunc \* \* \* munere*.

If this interpretation be right, there can be no question that the Cato Maior, included as it is in the list summed up in *adhuc haec erant*, was written before the death of Caesar occurred to interrupt the series of Cicero's philosophical works.

## V.—STUDY OF A PROVERB ATTRIBUTED TO THE RHETOR APOLLONIUS.

In treating of the orator's use of the pathetic appeal (de Inventione I 56, 109 fin.) Cicero closes as follows:

Commotis autem animis, diutius in conquestione morari non oportebit; quem ad modum enim dixit rhetor Apollonius, *lacrima nihil citius arescit*.

Fr. Marx in his Prolegomena to Incerti auctoris de ratione dicendi ad Herennium (Lipsiae, 1894), p. 124, in comparing this passage with ad Herenn. II 31, 50: commiserationem brevem esse oportet: *nihil enim lacrima citius arescit*, makes three observations; first, that whereas one might be tempted to admire this phrase *quasi vere Romani saporis* Cicero, in attributing the same expression to the rhetor Apollonius *multo est diligentior et accuratior*; second, that in the Cologne edition of 1539 Gybertus Longolius reconstructed as the original Greek,

οὐδὲν θᾶσσον ξηραίνεσθαι δακρύου,

which is given under ξηραίνω in the thesaurus of Stephanus: and third, the words are easily made into an iambic trimeter:

θᾶσσον γὰρ οὐδὲν δακρύου ξηραίνεται,

which, so far as he knows, is extant in no Greek writer.

There is however another passage from Cicero, which Marx does not cite, which seems to bear directly upon the question. In the Partitiones Oratoriae written perhaps in 54 B. C. (Schanz Röm. Litteraturgeschichte I, p. 290; Marx, Proleg., p. 77) in Ch. 17 § 57:

Nihil est tam miserabile quam ex beato miser. Et hoc totum est quod moveat, si qua ex fortuna quis cadat et a quorum caritate divellatur, quae amittat aut amiserit, in quibus malis sit futurusve sit, exprimatur breviter, *Cito enim exarescit lacrima praesertim in alienis malis*.

The last phrase is misquoted by Otto (Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer), p. 184. The correct reading is *exarescit* (*arescit* is Orelli's suggestion based on the two passages quoted above) and *malis* should be read not *rebus*. As the words stand in the Partitiones Oratoriae, with the omission of *praesertim*, we have an iambic senarius:

*Cito enim exarescit lacrima in alienis malis.*

Hence it is reasonable again to open the question as to whether the words attributed to Apollonius were in verse. If so, there is a probability that he like other writers on rhetoric was quoting. Still the Latin verse may have been accidental, written unconsciously; for an original prose quotation from the Greek might have fallen into rhythm in Cicero's mind, to suit the *sententia*, which we shall see became a favorite among the later Roman students of rhetoric. The end of a paragraph or a discussion was a natural place for a pithy quotation, and a quotation was often the best way to reinforce an argument, as is evident in the rhetorical writings of Cicero, the *Controversiae* of Seneca the Rhetor and the *Naturales Quaestiones* of Seneca the Philosopher.

Although the phrase may not occur in extant Greek literature, there is a monostich of Menander (426) which describes the forced tears of the orator (but not the tears of his audience):

ὁμοία πόρνη δάκρυα καὶ ῥήτωρ ἔχει.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, inasmuch as the quotation occurs in Latin in two forms, one longer and affirmative the other shorter, negative and in the comparative, we may assume that in the Greek there were either two forms, or that one form was differently translated or paraphrased, or that there was a longer form, let us say a couplet, given more fully in one version than in another (either affirmative or comparative). For example we may conjecture:

1. Short affirmative,

κακοῖς ἐν ἄλλων τάχα δάκρυ ξηραίνεται.

2. Long affirmative,

τὸ δάκρυον γὰρ τάχα καταξηραίνεται

τὸ δὲ κεχυμένον ἐν κακοῖς ἀλλοτριόις.

<sup>1</sup> So in the *Eunuchus* of Terence translated from Menander in l. 67 ff. in the opening scene:

Haec verba una mehercle falsa lacrimula  
Quam oculos terendo misere vix vi expresserit,  
Restinguet, et te ultro accusabit—

Persius, Sat. V 161, quoting Menander:

Dave, cito, hoc credas iubeo, finire dolores  
*Praeteritos meditor.*

The phrasing is imitated from Hor., Sat. II 3, 263; who follows Terence:  
an potius mediter finire dolores?

Terence's words are:

An potius ita me comparem  
Non perpeti meretricum contumelias?



## 3. Short negative,

θάσσον γὰρ οὐδὲν δακρύου ξηραίνεται.

## 4. Long negative,

θάσσον γὰρ οὐδὲν δακρύου ξηραίνεται  
τοῦ δὲ χυθέντος ἐν κακοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις.

Again it is not necessary to assume that the γνώμη is original with Apollonius. For in the first place he was the pupil of Menecles of whom Cicero says in Brutus § 326 [Hortensius] habebat enim et Menecium illud studium *crebrarum venustarumque sententiarum*, in quibus, ut in illo Graeco sic in hoc, erant quaedam magis venustae dulcesque sententiae quam aut necessariae aut interdum utiles. In the second place it is not likely that he introduced an original trimeter, if it was a trimeter, into a lecture on the ἐπίλογος. Reports of the lectures of Apollonius were used by both Cicero and the Auctor ad Herennium in compiling their rhetorical treatises (Marx Proleg., Schanz, pp. 389–390). In composing at a later period a treatise for the benefit of his son, Cicero has given the most explicit form of this dictum. At any rate the words:

‘Quick dries the tear that’s shed for another’s ills’

need little commentary, whereas

‘Naught dries more quickly than a tear’

unless qualified, seems a pointless exaggeration, as we all know the effects of genuine sorrow. This qualification is implicit in the context, yet is elaborated by Quintilian, when he treats of the epilogus.<sup>1</sup>

Before discussing further the meaning and origin of the phrase, it might be well to cite other references to it. Otto (o. c. s. *lacrima*) quotes, besides the three passages given above the following:

Q. Curt. 5, 5, 11, ignorant quam celeriter lacrimae inarescant. Quint. 6, 1, 27, nec sine causa dictum est, nihil facilius quam lacrimas inarescere.

Quint. declam., p. 331, 8 R. et illud verissimum (*not veri simillimum*) est, lacrimas celerrime inarescere. Iul. Sever. praec. art. rhet. 24, p. 370 (Halm), lacrimis comparati sunt, quibus nihil citius arescit.

Otto compares:

‘Hitze Thränen trocknen bald’  
(Körte, n. 7462.)

<sup>1</sup>Of one of the two rhetors named Apollonius of Rhodes, Cicero remarks in de Oratore I 17, 75, inrisit ille quidem ut solebat philosophiam atque contempsit multaque non tam graviter dixit quam facete. The cynicism of the dictum *nihil lacrima*, etc., would accord well with this characterization.

Besides these I think the following passages should be noted. In Cicero ad Att. X 14 (B. C. 49), where he is writing of the grief of Servius Sulpicius, who is in a dilemma between Caesar and Pompey and is weeping for himself and his country we read:

Atque haec ita *multis cum lacrimis* loquebatur, ut ego mirarer, *eas tam diuturna miseria non exaruisse*. The allusion here is to genuine sorrow for one's own fortunes as well as those of others, and Cicero is surprised that Sulpicius could have wept so long. The phrase while generally found in rhetorical writings as a rhetorical precept may well have found a place in *consolationes* also. For compare the epilogue of Tusc. Disp. III (on *consolationes*) 31 § 75. (Artemisia) quam diu vixit, vixit in luctu eodemque etiam confecta contabuit. Huic erat illa opinio cotidie recens, quae tum denique non appellatur recens, *cum vetustate exaruit*.

There is another reference in Quint., XI 1, 6, ita . . . neque humile atque cotidianum sermonis genus et compositione ipsa dissolutum *epilogis* dabimus *nec iocis lacrimas*, ubi opus erit miseratione, *siccabimus*. So cf. § 54. Tac., Germania 27, lamenta ac *lacrimas cito*, dolorem et tristitiam tarde *ponunt*; feminis lugere honestum est, viris meminisse. Here a fact is stated in a rhetorical antithesis. Cf. Seneca, Ep. 99, 25, meminisse perseveret, lugere desinat.

Again in Juvenal 16, 27, there is a phrase, which suggests a modification of a familiar proverb by this most rhetorical of Roman satirists, after the manner in which proverbs are changed in 4, 89; 7, 48, 202; 12, 129-130:

Quis tam procul absit ab urbe  
Praeterea, quis tam Pylades, molem aggeris ultra  
Ut veniat? *lacrimae siccantur protinus* et se  
Excusaturos non sollicitemus amicos.

The point is here that tears which would be of no avail should be quickly dried up, for it would be hard to get a witness to appear before a military judge already prejudiced against a civilian.

A number of late writers on rhetoric, even when their treatises are most condensed in following Cicero appear to recognize and paraphrase the dictum:

Fortunatianus II 31 (H), Quid *καθόλου* in *epilogis* servandum est? ut breves sint, quoniam commotus iudex statim dimittendus ad sententiam ferendam, dum adversario irascitur, et cum in

nostram misericordiam provocatus est lacrimis, etiam commotus statim debet ferre sententiam dum pro nobis movetur.

Martianus Capella c. 53: in epilogis generaliter observandum ut brevis sit, si quidem commotus iudex statim dimittendus est ad sententiam proferendam, dum aut adversariis irascitur aut tuis miseretur lacrimis aut rerum afflictatione commotus est.

Jul. Victor 436 (H.), qua oratione habita graviter et sententiose maxime dimittitur animus hominum et ad misericordiam comparatur cum *in alieno malo* suam infirmitatem considerabit.

Victorinus, Explanationum in Rhet. M. T. C. Lib. I (H), p. 257. Illud tamen praeceptum tenere debemus, sive in indignatione sive in conquestione nos locis omnibus uti non oportere, sed his quos causa suggerat, neque his omnibus sed quoad iudicantium animi moveantur. Quod si etiam uno aliquo loco factum viderimus, orationem continuo finire debemus; *ira enim vel lacrimae dum incipiunt ac recentes* sunt, plurimum valent.

Having noted the persistence with which this dictum was propagated among the late excerptors, it may be in place to analyze several of the earlier passages. Quintilian, 6, 1, 27-29, following Cicero says: Numquam tamen debet esse longa miseratio, nec sine causa dictum est, *nihil facilius quam lacrimas inarescere*. Nam cum etiam veros dolores mitigat tempus, *citius evanescat necesse est illa quam dicendo effinximus imago*: in qua si moramur, *lacrimis fatigatur auditor et requiescit*, et ab illo quem ceperat impetu ad rationem redit. Non patiamur igitur frigescere hoc opus, et affectum cum ad summum perduxerimus, relinquamus, nec speremus fore ut *aliena quisquam diu ploret*. Here we should note how the writer has given in this paragraph four different versions of the sentiment, while still another occurs in the discussion of the epilogue in XI 1, 6, cited above.

Quintus Curtius V 5, 11 ffg. has overelaborated the idea and used it to motivate the highly rhetorical speech of Euctemon of Cyme. Four thousand captive Greeks, who had received cruel punishment, had effected their escape to Alexander. The sight was so pathetic that *plures . . . lacrimas commovere quam profuderant ipsi*: quippe in tam multiplici variaque fortuna singulorum intuentibus similes quidem sed tamen dispaes poenas, quis maxime miserabilis esset, liquere non poterat. Then the King wiping away his tears promised the captives that they should see their homes again. Next follows the speech of Euctemon (5, 5, 11-12) which is nothing but an elaboration of this

τόπος. Atqui optime miserias ferunt, qui abscondunt, nec ulla tam familiaris est infelicibus patria, quam solitudo et status prioris oblivio. Nam qui multum in suorum misericordia ponunt, ignorant, *quam celeriter lacrimae inarescant*. Ita suam quisque fortunam in consilio habet, cum *de aliena* deliberat. This is nothing but highly colored declamation.

S. Dosson (*Étude sur Quinte Curce*, Paris, 1887, pp. 244-6), having compared the rhetorical sentiments in IX 2, 8-11; IX 3, 1-15; IX 4, 16-20, with Seneca's first *Suasoria*, passes on to this episode and Euctemon's speech, adding that although we have no contemporary declamation with which to compare it, we may believe, that if Curtius devoted so much space to developing the sentiment, he must have been moved to do so by the success of some one of his contemporaries, perhaps one of those very declaimers against whom Petronius inveighs for having elaborated a similar theme (Sat. 1, 1): *nun alio genere furiarum declamatores inquietantur, qui clamant: "haec vulnera pro libertate publica excepi; hunc oculum pro vobis impendi: date mihi ducem qui me ducat ad liberos meos, nam succisi poplites membra non sustinent"*. In fact Euctemon's speech reads like a rhetorical exercise, a *χρεια*, elaborating the proverb along the line satirized in Petronius. The very citation of the rhetorical precept introduces us into the atmosphere of the schools.

The example in Ps.-Quint. declam. 3, 38 is in the *sermo de prooemio et epilogo*, again from a rhetorical discussion.

The following recapitulation will show how the quotation has been used:

#### I. Negative form with comparative:

1. Auct. ad Herenn., nihil lacrima citius arescit.
2. Cic. de Invent., lacrima nihil citius arescit.
3. Quint. (a) nihil facilius quam lacrimas inarescere.
4. Jul. Severian., lacrimis quibus nihil citius arescit.

#### II. Affirmative (or with litotes.)

1. Cic. part. or., cito exarescit lacrima in alienis malis.
2. Cic. ep. ad Att., eas (lacrimas) tam diuturna miseria non exaruisse.
3. Cic. Tusc. Disp. III. 31, 75, opinio (luctus) cum vetustate exaruit.
4. Q. Curtius, quam celerrime lacrimae inarescant.

5. Quint.

- (b) veros dolores mitigat tempus.
- (c) citius evanescat imago.
- (d) lacrimis requiescit.
- (e) non . . . aliena . . . diu ploret.
- (f) XI 1, 6, nec . . . lacrimas . . . siccabimus.

6. Ps.-Quint., lacrimas celerrime inarescere.

7. Tacitus, lacrimas cito . . . ponunt.

8. Juvenal, lacrimae siccentur protinus.

9. Victorinus, lacrimae dum recentes sunt.

[10. Fortunatianus, lacrimis commotus . . . statim debet ferre, etc.]

[11. Mart. Cap., dum tuis miseretur lacrimis aut rerum afflictatione commotus est.]

[12. Jul. Victor, sententiose, etc. . . in alieno malo.]

A study of the different forms of statement shows that the favorite Roman form was affirmative; that in this form the compounded verb *exarescere* or *inarescere* was usual; the dictum, where the cases of use are certain, is confined to rhetoricians, or writers steeped in the precepts of the schools. The differences in phraseology do not necessarily point to differences in the rendering of some well-known Greek verse or proverb. So far as the Latin is concerned, they all seem to go back to Cicero, who may have been exploited here by the Auct. ad Herenn.; Cicero and the Auctor may both go back to notes on the lectures of Apollonius. The question then arises, is there any evidence that the Greek form was a popular proverb, or rhetorical precept, or a line from some poet? It seems to have been applied by Apollonius as an illustration of restraint in handling the epilogus. It does not appear in Aristotle nor in the late Greek writers on rhetoric who followed the ancient traditions. If Apollonius (whether ὁ μαλακός v. Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encycl. Apollon. nr. 84, line 55 ff., or Molo ibid. nr. 85, cf. Susemihl II 489-494) took after Menecles, his master, whose fondness for embellished style is noted in Cic. Brutus § 326, we may suspect that he borrowed from the Greek poets many of his fine phrases just as did the later writers on rhetoric.

Now let us turn once more to the context of Cic., part. orat., § 17 (and the result is essentially the same for Cic., de Invent. and Auct. ad Herenn.). After detailing the many devices by which the hearer's feelings may be aroused Cicero concludes: *nihil est*



*tam miserabile quam ex beato miser*, with an elaboration of this sentiment, ending *cito enim exarescit*, etc. It is doubtless going too far to suppose that *nihil est tam miserabile quam ex beato miser* is also from a Greek trimeter like

οὐ δυστυχέστερ' ἢ πένης ἐξ εὐτυχούς.

(Cf. Menand. Meineke 4, 247 (40))

πένητος οὐδέν ἐστι δυστυχέστερον

and monostich 436; Diph. 4, 424, 24). The sentiment is commonplace enough especially in the Greek tragedians (Eurip. Troad. 509-510, Troad. 639-640; frag. Arch. 232, 234, 264, Auge, 275, Beller. 287, Danae 328).

Now if we examine the treatise of the late Greek rhetorician Apsines (3d cent. A. D.), who, however, preserves the old Greek tradition (cf. Christ, Gr. Litt.-gesch., p. 755, § 549), we see that in discussing the proper use of 'pity', ἔλεος, in the ἐπίλογος, he quotes three times from Euripides' Troades (472-473; 474-478, 479-483), where Hecuba recites her former happiness in order to enhance her present affliction. Apsines adds:

ἡ ἀντιπαράθεσις τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τῶν κακῶν τὸν ἔλεον κεκίνηκεν. ἐλεεινοὶ μὲν γάρ εἰσι καὶ οἱ ὅπως οὖν δυστυχοῦντες, ἐλεεινότεροι δὲ εἶναι δοκοῦσιν οἱ ἐκ λαμπρᾶς εὐδαιμονίας συμφοραῖς μεγάλας χρώμενοι.

This corresponds closely to Cicero's *nihil est tam miserabile quam ex beato miser*. It should also be noted that Apsines closes his whole treatment of the subject (p. 329, Spengel-Hammer) with the words: δεῖ δὲ τὸ πάθος ἐν τῷ πολιτικῷ μέτρον ἔχειν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς τραγῳδίαν ἐμπίσῃ, πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἡ ὑπόθεσις τραγικὴ εἴη.

Now the parts of Hecuba's speech which are quoted, while they do not contain the idea 'quick dries the tear that's shed for another's ills' have in the text of Nauck 481-2 (cited differently by Apsines):

οὐκ ἄλλων πάρα

κλύουσ' ἐκλαυσα, τοῖσδε δ' εἶδον ὄμμασιν

and in 508-510

ὥς πεσοῦσ' ἀποφθαρῶ

δακρύοις καταξανθεῖσα. τῶν δ' εὐδαιμόνων

μηδένα νομίζετ' εὐτυχεῖν πρὶν ἂν θάνῃ.

While it is not essential to the argument to discuss the text of these last lines, I have a suggestion to make in passing. If καταξανθεῖσα be read, δακρύοις looks suspicious and Hartung pro-

posed ἄκραis or πέτροis. But καταξανθεῖσα (from καταξαίνω, 'tear in pieces', figuratively, 'wear or waste away') may be the false reading, for κατανανθεῖσα (from κατα-αναινω, dry up, wither up, pine away utterly) both αναινω and the compound being used in tragedy. The point would then be: Hecuba having pined away, from weeping till the fountain of her tears was dried, as a plant, that has lost its sap withers and falls, would herself fall and perish.

But to resume our argument. Let us suppose with Christ that Apsines is following the ancient tradition, which must have treated of the abuse as well as the proper use of πάθος. If the earlier lecturer, Apollonius, had used this speech of Hecuba, the two passages might have suggested, as a sort of corrective to the emotional tendency of some orators, some current proverb, some γνώμη from the New Comedy, or possibly a phrase from Euripides himself with which to refute that tragic poet out of his own book, as it were; and Apollonius might have warned his pupils, that a listener soon falls out of sympathy with a tragic character, a poet or an orator, who plays too long on one's feelings, for "naught dries more quickly than a tear, when shed for another's ills!"

A line of argument, such as we have considered, is in the nature of things mostly subjective. At all events we have Seneca's evidence (Contr. VII 4, 3) that Apollonius was 'strong on the epilogue' in epilogis vehemens fuit Apollonius Graecus,— if our Apollonius is the individual referred to; as well as Cicero's statement (De Or. I 17, 75) as to the scoffing attitude of one of the rhetors named Apollonius towards philosophy, and the evidence that his teacher Menecles was given to epigrams and an embellished style.

Such poetic snatches often become fixed as rhetorical precepts, just like Shakespeare's 'tear a passion to tatters' and 'speak it trippingly on the tongue'. The German proverb 'Hitzige Thränen trocknen bald' is not coextensive with *cito exarescit lacrima in alienis malis*, any more than our:

"Laugh and the world laughs with you  
Weep and you weep alone".

There is a cynical touch in 'quick dries the tear that's shed for another's ills', whereas 'nothing dries more quickly than a tear' could be used for comfort in a *consolatio*. Compare for example in Seneca Ep. 99, 16, in a composition of this type, the insincere grief of some: *sine spectatore cessat dolor*, an idea elaborated by Martial 1, 33 of Gellia *siquis adest missae prosiliunt lacrimae*.

So again Ep. 99, 21, in lacrimis aliquid sat est; § 25, meminisse perseveret, lugere desinat.

Ep. 63, 2. Duram tibi legem videor ponere, cum poetarum Graecorum maximus ius flendi dederit in unum dumtaxat diem, cum dixerit etiam Niobam de cibo cogitasse.

§ 3. Brevem illi (sc. amico) apud te memoriam promittis, si cum dolore mansura est.

§ 12. Malo relinquo dolorem quam ab illo relinquo, et quam primum id facere desiste, quod etiam si voles, diu facere non poteris.

§ 13. Quam tamen mihi ex illis mulierculis dabis vix retractis a rogo, vix a cadavere revulsis, cui lacrimae in totum mensem duraverint? nulla res citius venit in odium quam dolor qui recens consolatorem invenit et aliquos ad se adducit, inveteratus vero deridetur nec immerito, aut enim simulatus aut stultus est.

The allusion to Niobe is Homer, Iliad 24, 613:

*ἡ δ' ἄρα σίρον μῆσατ' ἐπεὶ κάμει δάκρυ χέουσα.*

Forced or insincere tears (our "crocodile" tears) are often mentioned, in Ovid, Martial, and others. The following three passages illustrate how quickly a new emotion may banish tears:

Ovid, Fasti III 509:

*Occupat amplexu lacrimasque per oscula siccant*

Ovid, Heroides XVIII 25-26:

*Dumque queror, lacrimae per amantia lumina manant  
Pollice quas tremulo conscia siccant anus, etc.*

Propert. 19, 23:

*Cogit et invitam lacrimas siccare cadentes*

Another side of the picture is to be seen in such statements as:

Cic., Ep. ad Fam. V 12, 5, ceteris vero nulla perfunctis propria molestia, casus autem alienos sine ullo dolore intuentibus etiam ipsa misericordia est iucunda.

Also Lucret. II 1-4, 19.

Sen., ad Polyb. de Consol. VI 5, ut periclitantium et ad misericordiam mitissimi Caesaris pervenire cupientium lacrimae [*sicari possint*] tibi tuae [*ante*] siccandae sunt.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

## VI.—STUDIES IN THE FIRST BOOK OF THE AENEID.

81 ff. montem impulit in latus et venti . . . qua data porta ruunt. The confusion between gate="way" and gate="barrier" is Latin as well as English. We have the former sense here and Val. Fl. I 596, the latter in Val. Fl. I 609 f., *valido contortam turbine portam impulit* Hippotades. But there is nothing to prove that Virgil, like Valerius, imagined the cave of Aeolus as having a gate of the second sort; *claustra*, v. 56, need denote only the mountain walls. A displacement of the mountain is not necessarily expressed by *impulit in latus*, words which are most simply interpreted from v. 125, in *puppim ferit*; nor is such an interpretation confirmed by Stat. Th. I 119 f., where *dubiam* may be proleptic: "Smote on the side (the peak of) Oeta so that it tottered on its ridge". Nor again, if we accept the view of Weidner and Kappes, that the winds rushed out at the point where Aeolus struck, are we to suppose that the poet pictured to himself a hole made in the mountain side. Deuticke's remark, that it is unnecessary to ask how the opening was closed again, contains only half the truth; it is equally unnecessary to ask wherein it consisted, and we may most truly say that in a human sense there was no opening. Of the miraculous stroke with its various effects there are many examples. It releases the winds here and in Luc. II 456, the waters in Exod. 17. 6 and Ov. Met. I 283; evokes from the earth the horse in Georg. I 13 and Luc. VI 396, woman in the Greenland story recorded in Tylor's *Early History of Mankind*, p. 326;<sup>1</sup> inspires strength and courage in Il. N 59, effects strange changes in Exod. 7. 20, 8. 17, Od. κ 238. 319, π 172. 456, and opens the way to the subterranean world in Ov. Met. V 421. In some of these cases the strength of the blow is specified or suggested; Circe's victims must have tasted her food and drink;<sup>2</sup> in the O. T. passages

<sup>1</sup> "The only man who remained alive" (after the deluge) "smote with his stick upon the ground, and there came forth a woman, with whom he peopled the earth again".

<sup>2</sup> For this there is of course a distinct reason, that for which, in Scott's *Redgauntlet*, the tenant who has descended to hell for his landlord's receipt abstains from the wine there offered him. *Wess Brod ich ess', dess Lied ich*

the result is a fulfilment of the divine promise. And sometimes the explanation lacking in one author is given by another; Virgil, Aen. VII 19. 190, makes Circe a brewer of drugs, and in Ov. Met. I 716 Mercury's wonder-working rod is *medicata virga*. It is instructive to compare Ov. Met. III 189 ff. with the story, in the Arabian Nights, of the sorceress who "took a cup, and filled it with water, and repeated a spell over it, and sprinkled with it the calf". Such amplifications are not always due to rationalism; certainly the spoken charm is as primitive a part of magic as the symbolic act. But where the unexplained and unaccompanied act is followed by the due effect, we need not question with the narrator concerning the means of accomplishment; the fundamental explanation of all miracles is *ῥεῖα θεός*.

142 dicto citius. The explanation of Servius, non antequam diceret . . . sed citius quam dici potest, must be adopted for *d. citius* or *celerius* in Hor. S. II 2. 80, Phaedr. App. II 9. 28, Petron. 131, Plin. N. H. XXXVI 138 and Anth. L. Burm. IV 252. 2; also in Sen. Apoc. 13. 2, if the words *Ille—impulit* are allowed to stand. If they are bracketed, either interpretation is possible, as it is also in Liv. XXIII 47. 6 and Petron. 74, and therefore the Servian is preferable, since it is probable that in these combinations *dicto* had a fixed value. And there is some weight in the comparison with Cic. Ph. II 33. 82, citius facta quam dixi; there we have the definite, here the indefinite narrator, as in Eur. Hipp. 1186, *θᾶσσον ἢ λέγοι τις*.

174 ff. ac primum silici scintillam excudit Achates succepitque ignem foliis atque arida circum nutrimenta dedit rapuitque in fomite flammam. This way of getting fire, grown unfamiliar since the invention of lucifer matches, may be illustrated by a modern description (Life of Sir George Grove, by C. E. Graves, p. 14):<sup>1</sup> "An old blind woman came up the street every Tuesday afternoon. She sold what we then called matches, thin strips of firewood about eight inches long by half an inch wide,

*sing'* has a sinister sense where the Chthonians are concerned. So in Morris's Cupid and Psyche (but not in Apuleius) Psyche in the hall of Dis eats the food that she has brought with her.

<sup>1</sup> The quotation is taken from an autobiographical fragment by Grove, which deals with his life about 1836. He goes on to speak of the introduction of the lucifer match, called then the "Congry" from its inventor, Sir William Congreve. As the latter died in 1828, it would seem that his match came into use slowly. For another description see Kinglake, Eothen, ch. XII.



pointed at each end, and with each" (*sic*) "end dipped in sulphur. Lights were then obtained by striking a piece of steel with a bit of flint over a round tinder-box which contained burnt rags. The sparks caught the tinder directly, and one poked the sparks with the sulphur end of the match, and by blowing, and then being nearly suffocated in the process, a light was obtained." Here are three distinct steps, marked more briefly in Val. Fl. II 449 f., *citum strictis alius de cautibus ignem ostendit foliis et sulphure pascit amico*. Like Valerius, Juvenal, XIII 145 (V 48 and Stat. S. I 6. 74 are doubtful), and Pliny, N. H. XXXVI 138, use the abstract *sulphur* for the "sulphur-sticks" (Wilson on Juv. V 48), which by Martial, I 41. 4, are called *sulphurata* (sc. *ramenta*, cf. X 3. 3, Sen. N. Q. I 1. 8) and *taedae* by Ovid, Her. VII 25, Met. III 373 f. (*summis circumlita taedis sulphura*=Grove's "sulphur end of the match"). Virgil marks the three steps by *scintillam*, *ignem*, *flammam*,<sup>1</sup> but inserts a fourth which is ambiguous; the word *nutrimenta* recalls on the one hand the Valerian *sulphure pascit*, on the other Ov. Met. VIII 642, *foliisque et cortice sicco nutrit*; in Val. Max. II 4. 5 it has the general sense of "anything to feed a fire." On the contrary, *fomes* has, according to the ancient grammarians, a specific signification: Serv. D. ad h. l., *fomites sunt assulae quae ab arboribus cadunt quando inciduntur*; Paul. p. 84 M. and Gloss. Labb. in Lewis and Short; Isid. Or. XVII 6. 26, *fomes est hastula quae ab arboribus excutitur recisione*; Gloss. in the Thesaurus s. v. *assula*, *fomes astula minuta*. The rendering "chips", or "kindling", suits alike the Virgilian passage, Luc. VIII 776, *excitat invalidas admoto fomite flammam*, and Apul. Apol. p. 428 ed. Flor., *cur cava specula, si exadversum soli retineantur, appositum fomitem accendant*;<sup>2</sup> but modern authorities exhibit also the translation "tinder", and this evidently underlies the explanation of the Virgilian *fomite* as "leaves" (Ladewig, Gebhardi, Henry, doubtfully Conington), as to which Kvičala remarks that the idea has already been expressed in *succepitque ignem foliis*. This rendering perhaps originated in a misunderstanding of Plin. N. H. XVI 207 f., *calidae et morus*,

<sup>1</sup> As is pointed out by Kappes, who however does not explain the process clearly; Mr. Page does, but obscures the matter again by his double rendering of *fomes*.

<sup>2</sup> If Scaliger's *fomes* for *fumus* in Moret. 8 is correct, it must be explained from Clodius Scriba ap. Serv. l. c., as emended by Thilo.

laurus, hedera et omnes e quibus igniaria<sup>1</sup> fiunt. Exploratorum hoc usus in castris pastorumque reperit, quoniam ad excudendum ignem non semper lapidis occasio est. teritur ergo lignum ligno, ignemque concipit attritu, excipiente materia aridi fomitis, fungi vel foliorum facillimo conceptu. On this Scaliger has the following note: "Aridi fomitis: eum olim lucubrum vocaverunt. Paratur fere ex sulphuratis, fungis arborum insolatis et arefactis, acie sive acu nimirum carpto carminatoque lino vel stupa ut in Moreto: et producit acu stupas humore carentes: nimirum *εἰς τὸ ζωπύριον καὶ ἔγκαυσμα πυρός*. Hanc *λυχνάφειαν* Gloss. vetus appellat, canapturam." The influence of this note is perhaps seen in Rob. Stephanus, Thes. L. L. (Lugd. 1589) s. v. *fomes*, who, after citing Festus (sc. Paulus) l. c., adds: "Ponitur et pro omni materia sicca quae facile igni inflammatur. Virg. I Aen., Plin. lib. 16 cap. 40"; certainly in Gesner's edition of Faber's Thesaurus (Lips. 1735), where *fomes* is defined bilingually: "1. *ein Span*, G. *copeau, éclat*", with reference to Festus and to Salmas. ad Solin., p. 127; "2. et aridum quodcumque ignis nutrimentum, *zunder*, G. *mêche*", with reference to Dalechamp's Pliny. In Forcellini—De Vit. there is only the general definition, "materia arida idonea ut facile ignescat"; this also in Forcellini—Bailey, but with the confused addition, "fuel, coal, wood, *ὑπόκαυσμα*". There is confusion also in Lewis and Short, while Koch<sup>3</sup>—Georges, Wörterb. z. Än., has only "Zündstoff, Zunder"; and "tinder, Zunder" appear in Virgilian commentaries (Sidgwick, Page, Deuticke).

<sup>1</sup>"*Igniarium* an implement for producing fire", Lewis and Short. Tylor, Early History of Mankind, p. 240, coins the word "fire-drill" (which is quoted from him in the Oxford Dictionary) and describes various forms of the process. His remarks, p. 238, on the difficulties attending it and the consequent Australian practice of borrowing fire from a neighbor may be illustrated from Latin literature: Cic. Off. I 16. 52, *pati ab igne ignem capere, si qui velit*; Rhet. ad Her. IV 53. 67, *hic de tanto patrimonio tam cito testam, qui sibi petat ignem, non reliquit*; cf. Od. ε 490. For the *testa* cf. Kipling, Jungle Tales, 1st Ser., p. 33: "He saw the man's child pick up a wicker pot plastered inside with earth, fill it with lumps of red-hot charcoal", etc. Probably Juv. I 134, *ignis emendus*, represents a business transaction of the same sort, *ignis* being not fuel but fire-brands, as in Aen. V 660, Liv. IV 33. 2, and often in Tacitus, cf. Gerber and Greef s. v.; cf. Baedeker's Holland, 1894, Pref., p. XXVI, Eng. tr.: "At the cellar-doors in the side-streets, sign-boards with the words *water en vuur te koop* (water and fire to sell) are frequently observed. At these humble establishments boiling-water" (sc. *Kochwasser*) "and red-hot turf" (Anglice, *peat*) "are sold to the poorer classes for the preparation of their tea or coffee."

It does not appear that Scaliger looked beyond the Plinian passage in giving his explanation, which seems to rest primarily on the idea that tinder of some sort was necessary for making fire; but his *sulphuratis* would seem to show that he included sulphur matches along with rag tinder as something which might receive the spark from the fire-drill, as they do from the flint and steel in Plin. XXXVI 138, qui (pyritae) clavo vel altero lapide percussi scintillam edunt, quae excepta sulphure aut fungis aridis vel foliis dicto celerius praebebat ignem. The descriptions cited by Tylor, so far as I have been able to look them up, generally stop short at the production of the spark without explaining to what material it is transmitted; but Morgan, League of the Iroquois, p. 381, quoted by Tylor, p. 248, speaks of "small pieces of punk" being used to catch the spark. Supposing that ordinary chips could not be made to serve, it seems quite possible to understand Pliny's *aridi fomitis* of such bits of punk, or touch-wood, while I find no ancient authority for applying the word to any other material than wood. In this case the sequence *fomitis, fungi, foliorum*, XVI 208, corresponds to the sequence *sulphure, fungis, foliis*, XXXVI 138. Pliny's *excipiente*—*conceptu* is to be explained from N. H. XXXVII 51, chryselectrum . . . rapacissimum ignium, si iuxta fuerint, celerrime ardescens; for while *ignem concipere* in general use = *accendi, ardescere*, and denotes the production of fire in a material alike by primary action or by transmission from another already burning body, *excipere* and *rapere* express distinctly the latter process, the second body catching fire from the first. For *excipere* we have, besides the two Plinian passages, Ambros. Hexaem. II 3. 29 (Migne XIV, p. 152. A), nam sive ex lignis haud quaquam semiustulatis, sed inter se collisis, ignis excussus excipiat foliis, etiam flamma adolet, ac si de igne accendas facem; for *rapere* Ov. Met. III 374, XV 350, Plin. N. H. II 235, Luc. III 684, Aen. h. l. That Virgil should transfer to the person the action usually predicated of the material, is not more remarkable than other, more familiar forms of transferred predication, e. g. Aen. VI 429 = XI 28. For a *rapere* = *iactare* no support is to be had from Aen. IV 286, cited by Mr. Bonner, Cl. Journ. I, p. 49, since there the necessary "to and fro" is expressed by the prepositional phrase. Tac. H. I 13, spem adoptionis statim conceptam acrius in diem rapiebat, shows of course a metaphor based on *ignem concipere, rapere*, but stands in no direct relation to the Virgilian passage; Otho is not, like

Achates, the maker of the fire of hope, but the material on which it feeds; Professor Tyrrell's translation (Academy, Sept. 29, 1906, p. 309), "he fanned every day to a brighter flame the spark of hope once lit", involves a misunderstanding of *conceptam* as well as of *rapiebat*.

219 *extrema pati*. In IX 204, cited by Deuticke, *extrema* denotes peril and distress, not death (cf. III 315); nor is Conington's citation of Tac. H. IV 59 to the point, since there, as *ibid.* II 46 and Liv. VIII 25. 7, the phrase *extrema pati* does not expressly include death. This is the case also in Caes. B. C. II 32. 8, *extremam fortunam pati*, and Aen. II 349, *audentem extrema*, cf. Tac. G. 18. The notion of death is sometimes distinctly excluded from the phrase *ultima pati*, for which cf. Liv. III 47. 2, XXII 60. 23, XXXVII 54. 2, Ov. Met. XIV 483, *id.* Tr. II 187, III 2. 11, Curt. III 1. 6, Sen. Benef. III 18. 3. *Extrema = mors* occurs also in Aen. VI 457, perhaps Tac. H. II 47; that this sense is derived immediately from the temporal signification, is suggested by Cic. Fam. VI 21. 1, *cum omnium rerum mors sit extremum* (cf. Hor. Ep. I 16. 79, II 2. 173, Aen. II 447, Sil. V 416), and is confirmed by the example of *suprema*. This superlative, as substantive, denotes "last moments" in Quintil. VI pr. 11 (cf. Cels. II 6, p. 36, 4, Dar., *ad ultima iam ventum esse*, Papin. Dig. XXXIX 6. 42. 1, in *extremis vitae constitutus*); hovers ambiguously between that sense and "time of death" in Plin. N. H. II 232, VII 33, XVI 236, Tac. A. VI 50, XII 66, XVI 11, *ib.* 25; and signifies "death" without temporal connotation in Tac. A. III 49, XV 59, XVI 34, perhaps H. IV 59.

As parallel to the Virgilian *extrema pati* some editors have cited *mortem pati = mori*, Ov. Tr. I 2. 42 (cf. *id.* Met. X 627), Sen. Ep. 94. 7, Lact. Epit. 50. 1. Conington alone seems expressly to have remarked on the difficulty attending this comparison, though it was evidently present to the mind of Weidner, who translates: "Entweder ringen die Gefährten noch mit dem Tode (*extrema patiuntur*) oder sie sind überhaupt schon todt = *nec iam vocati exaudiunt*", and adds: "Da nun das *extrema pati* den Tod selbst nicht ausschliesst, darum wird dieser Begriff mit dem folgenden vereinigt dem *vivere* gegenüber gestellt"; that is, we are to take *que* here as in II 37. The rubric "*que, et for aut*" is still waiting for its chapter (see Leo, Hermes XLII, p. 52, n. 3); until that is written, the possibility here of *neque = aut non* can neither be affirmed nor denied. Conington suggests another point of view:

"It is not necessary to limit the meaning of *extrema* actually to the crisis of death . . . as that would require *passos esse*. The expression rather implies death as a continuing state 'to be lost'". That Lat. *mors* and Engl. "death" may denote either (1) the act of dying, or (2) the state of being dead, is a fact not recognized by Lewis and Short; but no blame attaches to the Latinists for failing to note a distinction, which seems to have been clearly recognized by no English lexicographer before Dr. Murray. For Latin cf., e. g., Cic. C. M. 20. 74 post mortem sensus, with id. Tusc. I 12. 27, in morte sensum. That *extrema*, denoting primarily the last stage of life, should come to signify the transition from life to lifelessness, is not strange; that it should be used also of the state resulting from that transition, is a somewhat remarkable effect of its association with *mors*. The only parallel known to me is Val. Max. VI 1 ext. 4, ultimo fati sui tempore, i. e., as the context shows, *iam mortuus*. Our "eschatology" assumes that τὰ ἔσχατα may = τὸ τεθνάναι; I have not been able to find on what Greek use the assumption is based. That in some ranges of Greek τὰ ἔσχατα = τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν, appears from Wahl, Clavis Apocryphorum, who cites Sir. 1. 11, 7. 36, 28. 6, 51. 14 for ἔσχατα "Lebensende"; in N. T. I find only Mark, 5. 23, τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει (cf. Lob. Phryn., p. 389, Grimm, Clavis N. T., s. v. ἐσχάτως), and in Stephanus, Thes. Gr., ed. Didot. III, p. 2113, "Artemid. II 26, p. 114. 30 πρὸς ἐσχάτοις ὄντες animam agentes".

Granting that Virgil used *extrema* to denote the state of being dead, it remains to define *pati*. That verb, primarily = τλῆναι, *tolerare*, becomes = πάσχειν; and both the Greek and the Latin word usually signify "experience" as an incident, "to have a thing done, or happen, to one". That πάσχειν may denote a continued experience, a state of being, is somewhat confusedly recognized by Liddell and Scott; we may pick out from their examples εὖ π. = *frui*, Theogn. and Pind., and add the instances of ἄλγεα, πῆματα π. in the Odyssey.<sup>1</sup> For *pati* Lewis and Short s. v. II B cite Quintil. I 2. 31, quiddam pati furori simile, with the renderings "to experience, undergo, to be in a certain state of

<sup>1</sup> α 49, γ 100 = δ 243, ε 33. 362. 395, θ 411, ι 121, π 189, ρ 444, τ 170, υ 221, χ 177. Perhaps not a complete list; and I have none for the Iliad. In π 275 and Hdt. III 146 κακῶς π. is not equivalent to κακῶς πράττειν; the only example of this substitution that I have observed is in the line κέκλυτέ μεν μίνθων, κακά περ πάσχοντες ἑταῖροι, [κ 189], μ 271. 340.



mind or temper"; add "or of body", and put under the same head the following, wrongly cited under I A 2: Quintil. XI 3. 32, si ipsa vox primum fuerit, ut sic dicam, sana, id est, si nullum eorum, de quibus modo rettuli, patietur incommodum ("be subject to, labor under"); Gell. XVII 15. 6, Livium Drusum . . . cum morbum, qui comitalis dicitur, pateretur, Anticyram navigasse ("being sick with the epilepsy"); Veget. Mulom. I 17. 11, iumentum quod morbum patitur ("diseased"). Of more weight for Virgil's use is Val. Fl. III 378 ff., mortalia membra sortitusque breves et parvi tempora fati perpetimur, where the compound is not, as usual, a synonym of *perferre*, but is the opposite of *perfrui*, a "be cursed with" instead of a "be blessed with".

In one respect *pali* fails to keep step with *πάσχειν*; it is not used, like the Greek verb, of pleasant experiences. And in the fact that it was at one time not capable of rendering *πάσχειν* is to be found, I think, the true explanation of Aen. VI 457, extrema secutam. In early Latin the verb of doing had to serve as a verb of experience. So Lucretius uses *fungi*;<sup>1</sup> cf. I 443, facere et fungi = ποιεῖν καὶ πάσχειν (but Cic. Tim. 6, Liv. II 12. 9, facere et pati), ibid. 441, III 734, V 358. So Pl. Most. 48, fungi fortunas meas; Lorenz translates "mein Schicksal erleiden", but this notion is expressed in v. 49, patiunda;<sup>2</sup> *fungi* is a colorless word, like *uti* (cf. Ter. Ph. Prol. 31, Vell. II 51. 1). The difference between *fungi* and *pali* here is the same as that between *exsequi* and *pati* in Pl. Capt. 195 f., si di immortales id voluerunt vos hanc aerumnā exsequi, decet id pati animo aequo; with which use of *exsequi* denoting "experience" instead of "accomplishment" cf. Trin. 686, Ps. 995 mortem exsequi = Ovid's m. pati), perhaps also Truc. 459. The verb shifts between two senses in Cic. Ph. II 22. 54, exsequi cladem illam (cf. Suet. Iul.

<sup>1</sup> Which retains this meaning in the classical *fato functus* (cf. also Ov. Met. XI 583, Vell. II 48. 6), often also in the participle *perfunctus* and in *defungi*. *Vita functus* = *mortuus*, Gell. XX 2. 3, Papin. Dig. XLVIII 5. 12 (II). 12, arrives at the idea from a different point of view; but how entirely the idea of death became connected with the phrase appears from Papin. Dig. XLIX 17. 14 pr., vita fungatur = *moriatur* (cf. Just. XIX 1. 1). Properly speaking of course, the combination should stand for *vivere*, as in Hor. C. II 9. 13, ter aeo functus, cf. Vell. II 131. 2, Lact. Inst. II 1. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The subjects of which are not "*fortuna et miseria*, inferred from their adjectives", as Professor Fay has it, but an implied pronoun in apposition with the preceding clauses: "these facts (that you are lucky, I unlucky) I must needs endure".

36, nullam cladem . . . passus est) fugamque (cf. Sall. I. 53. 3, fugam faciunt = *fugiunt*); it has the first sense in Cic. Att. IX 12. 1, cur non omnes fatum illius una exsecuti sumus (= *functi s.*). The genitive is remarkable, not unique; cf. Tac. A. XVI 34, mariti suprema et exemplum Arriae matris sequi; here, as in Cic. Ph. I. c., the verb changes meaning with the change of object. And as the Tacitean passage is related to Cic. Att. I. c. by the introduction of the genitive, so it is related to Virgil's phrase by the employment of the simple for the compound verb.<sup>1</sup> The poet's *extrema seculam* is a transformation of the Plautine *mortem exsequi* and a variant on the preceding *extinctam*.

The current explanation allows indeed more force to the participle. In Koch<sup>2</sup>—Georges the passage is cited under *sequor* 2 a) "gehe einer Sache nach, strebe nach"; in Lewis and Short under II B 2, "to follow or pursue an end or object, to strive for, aim at, seek to attain"; Mr. Sidgwick and Mr. Page render by "sought thy end (doom)". The familiar English "seek death" has its counterpart in "find death"; so in Latin *mortem quaerere*, Vell. I 2. 3, Tac. A. I 5, Plin. N. H. II 156, *m. invenire*, Tac. A. I 61. But Latin has also a *m. petere*: Cic. Fin. II 19. 61, Val. Max. V 6. 5. Whether *sequi* ever = *quaerere*, I cannot say; it certainly = *petere* with a local object; to the examples in L. and Sh. s. v. I B 4 add Cic. Leg. II 1. 3, where the abstract substantives must be rendered concretely, "this pleasant and healthful spot". But the examples cited do not prove a similar tropical use. Cic. Rep. III 11. 18, Mur. 27. 55, Ter. Andr. 811, Ad. 248 are to be explained as analogous to *viam, iter, s.*;<sup>2</sup> so too Hor. S. I 6. 86 f., *parvas mercedes s.*, which means not "try to get small wages", but "follow a poorly paid occupation"; here too belongs *sequi* with neuter pronoun or adjective, as in Aen. III 368, Hor. S. I 1. 3, Ep. I 8. 11. With Ter. Hec. 481 cf. Cic. Off. I 11. 35, 37. 133, II 20. 69, de Or. II 50. 204, Varr. R. R. I 2. 21, Sen. Benef. II 7. 3, IV 25. 1, where *sequi* = *spectare*, "have

<sup>1</sup> Nipperdey on Tac. A. VI 40, quod signum mortis intellexere et exsecuti sunt, says: "Zu *exsecuti sunt* ist *mortem* zu denken". It seems doubtful if *m. e.* = *m. sibi consciscere* (though Dido committed suicide, it is not necessary to read that idea into Virgil's line, where *mortuam* would suffice for the sense), and I should prefer to regard the verb as absolute, "they took action"; cf. A. VI 32. So too in H. IV 76 it is unnecessary to supply an object, even though *sententiam* suggests one; cf. H. III 73, Vell. II 24. 5.

<sup>2</sup> In literal sense Ov. P. I 4. 38, Tac. A. I 50, metaphorically Cic. Cat. IV 5. 9, Off. I 32. 118, Sen. Benef. II 7. 3, cf. Liv. XXIV 45. 7.

in view", a sense recognized in Forcellini—Bailey, and of which Gerber and Greef give Tacitean examples. *Gratiam, fidem alicuius sequi* means "to attach oneself to a person in friendship, loyalty"; cf. the examples of *amicitiam* s. in the Thesaurus under the same general head belong also Cic. Fam. XIII 35. 1, Off. I 37. 132, Liv. I 8. 3, XXXI 7. 11. Finally Aen. III 327 f. is to be interpreted from Plin. Ep. VIII 18. 8, secuta videbatur matrimonium senis = *seni nupsisse*. The use of *adsequi, consequi, sectari* seems indeed to make such a sense quite possible for *sequi*; the only passage I have noted where it can really be so interpreted is Cic. Off. I 31. 110, neque enim attinet naturae repugnare nec quicquam sequi, quod assequi non queas, where the contrast with the compound perhaps determined the choice, as it fixes the meaning, of the simple verb.

225 *latos populos*. The current explanation, *latos*=*late habitantes*, tends to create confusion by separating this passage from others which show the same peculiarity, the employment of a personal, where we should expect a territorial, designation. So in Liv. XXI 34. 1, perventum inde ad frequentem cultoribus alium . . . populum, editors usually render *populum* by "district"; Weissenborn refers to Grk. *δημος*, while Luterbacher thinks this rendering required by the epithet *frequentem*. But *p. fr. c.* is like Aen. IX 508, non tam spissa corona viris (cf. Ov. Am. III 5. 3, Met. VIII 329, Prop. II 32. 13, Tac. A. XIV 34, where *legionarius*=*legiones*); the ablative denotes the parts, the main substantive the whole. As to *δημος*, Festus defines correctly: *demoe apud Atticos sunt ut apud nos pagi*; and this applies also to the Homeric local *δημος*, which, like *pagus*, is commonly associated with a definite name, at its vaguest with a personal genitive, as Od. v 219, *ἄλλων δ.*; an *ἄλλος δ.* is as inconceivable as an *alius pagus*. It seems not to have been observed that, in using *populus* where we might expect *terra*<sup>1</sup> (cf. Cic. Fin. V 18. 49, Ov. Met. II 307, Sil. V 399), Virgil and Livy have gone only a step beyond the familiar usage, by which the proper name of a people is put to denote the territory. This happens oftenest

<sup>1</sup> The converse is the personal use of *urbs* (to examples in L. and Sh. add Luc. II 174) and *moenia* (Aen. VIII 385). It is worthy of note that in Aen. II 265 *urbem* as object of *invadunt* is local, with *sepultam* becomes personal; cf. Carlyle, French Revolution, Bk. IV ch. III: "Crack, crack, we go incessant, through the slumbering city". So the character of *civitas* changes with the verb in Liv. IV 2. 12, *armari civitatem* (the citizens) defendique (the state). On people for land see also Varr. L. L. V 32, Paul, Pr. § 248.

when the territory has no name of its own and could be distinguished only by a periphrasis; cf. Varr. R. R. I 14. 4, in agro Sabino, *ibid.* 15. 1, in Sabinis, Caes. B. G. I 11. 1, in Aeduorum fines pervenerant, *ibid.* §6, in Santonos pervenirent. But a writer may vary between tribal and local names: Plin. N. H. III 53 Tiberis . . . Etruriam ab Umbris ac Sabinis . . . dirimens (cf. Caes. B. G. I 8. 1, Tac. G. 1), but *ibid.* 51, tractus Umbriae. So in giving lists of towns Pliny varies between place and person: III 52 de cetero Arretini . . . Faesulae, §63 oppida Abellinum . . . Acerrani, cf. §68 f. In this way we may explain Aen. VII 631, Ardea Crustumerique (cf. Georg. II 138), better than by supposing that the poet lopped off the final syllable of Crustumeria (-um) for metre's sake; the fact that Livy has Crustumini need cause no difficulty in the case of a stem with several variations of suffix and a people almost mythical. A Greek parallel cited by Bernhardt, Gr. Synt., p. 47, is Lys. XX 4, ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἦν, οἱ δ' ἐν Βοιωτοῖς; add Thuc. I 12. 4, καὶ Ἴωνας μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ νησιωτῶν τοὺς πολλοὺς ᾤκισαν, Ἰταλίας δὲ καὶ Σικελίας τὸ πλεῖστον Πελοποννήσιοι. The explanation of Classen-Steup would require, not only that we take ᾤκισαν in a sense otherwise poetic and not Thucydidean, but, what is of more weight, that we understand Ἴωνας to refer to the Hellenic tribe of which the Athenians were reckoned a part, whereas Thucydides is likely to have used it only, as in c. 16. 1, to designate the Asiatic Ionians, and to have meant here what he expresses in c. 2. 6 by ἐς Ἴωνίαν . . . ἀποικίας ἐξέπεμψαν.

Ordinarily the use of tribal name for territory creates so little difficulty that school commentaries on B. G. I afford no note on it; it begins to be troublesome when local and personal names are brought into immediate relation. Not indeed in Liv. VI 3. 2, Etruria prope omnis armata Sutrium, socios p. R., obsidebat; we are accustomed to personifying country and city and easily render *socios* by a singular. But to less familiar combinations we have to do more violence in rendering. So at Aen. I 276 f., condet moenia Romanosque . . . dicet, Professor Knapp smoothes the schoolboy's way by suggesting *eos*; and at Andoc. Myst. 51, τὴν δὲ πόλιν ἐν κακοῖς οὖσαν τοῖς μεγίστοις καὶ ὑποψίαν εἰς ἀλλήλους ἔχοντας, Dobree's conjecture *ἀπαντας* was an attempt to impose our point of view on the Greek. We have the same easy shift from place to people in Thuc. I 27. 1, Aen. III 17 f., Liv. XXI 58. 2, from people to place in Hdt. VIII 127. Again at Aen. I 533, Italiam dixisse . . . gentem, to say that *gentem* = *terram* helps the school-

boy; but the passage is paralleled by Thuc. I 107. 2, Δωριῆς τὴν Ἀ. μητρόπολιν, and is the converse of Vell. I 3. 1, regionem . . . quae nunc . . . Thessalia appellatur, antea Myrmidonum vocitata civitas.<sup>1</sup> Similar is Aen. VII 670 f., Tiburtia moenia linquunt, fratris Tiburti dictam cognomine gentem; but that in such direct apposition we may have more to consider than mere variation of terms, appears from parallels in which the terms are not equivalent: Georg. II 97, Aminneae vites, firmissima vina, Aen. VIII 675, classis aeratas, Actia bella, X 161, sidera, opacae noctis iter. These cases of appositional epexegetis differ from such as Buc. II 3, densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos. The last, like the cases of epexegetis by *et* or *que* collected by Norden at Aen. VI 24, fall under the heading ἐν διὰ δυοῖν, since the two substantives denote the same object, and the omission of one would leave the sense unimpaired; in the first the appositive adds a new element, necessary to the development of the conception, and is in fact an abbreviated clause. With Aen. VII 670 cf. Aesch. Prom. 807 f., τηλουρὸν δὲ γῆν ἦξεις κελαυνὸν φύλον; we may translate "where the blacks live" or "the country of the blacks", but φύλον is not local, nor is *gentem*. With Georg. l. c., where the appositive denotes that which comes from the antecedent, cf. Eur. Phoen. 174, σφάγια δ' ἄμ' αὐτῷ, γῆς φιλαίματοι ῥοαί; contrast I. A. 1113 f., where φνσήματα is, after the more common form of speech, appositive to the clause. Aen. VIII 675, X 161 might be compared with Ov. Met. VI 131, pictas, caelestia crimina, vestes, and with Val. Fl. I 22 f., Pelias . . . longus populis metus, but for the fact that an habitually verbal substantive easily suggests concrete equivalents, whereas *bella* has no such plasticity, and *iter*, which might be plastic, has its concrete sense predetermined by long usage. But we have a parallel in Cic. Fin. II 19. 61, P. Decius, princeps in ea familia consulatus, and an interpretation in Off. I 39. 138, Cn. Octavius, qui primus ex illa familia consul factus est. It seems to me possible to explain by the same abrupt apposition Tac. H. I 2, haustae et obrutae urbes, fecundissima Campaniae ora; and Browning, in the prologue to *Balaustion*, seems to have fallen into something of the sort: "We turned The glad prow westward;

<sup>1</sup> Flor. II 7. 1 is not parallel; the personal character of *gentes Macedonia*, etc. is marked by *neminem puduit*. And Caes. B. C. I 18. 1 is in so far different, as the passage from personal to local term is effected by the relative, which may involve a genitive; cf. Liv. XXI 5. 4 quo metu, XXII 17. 3 quo discursu.



soon were out at sea Pushing, brave ship with the vermilion cheek, Proud for our heart's true harbor".

Two cases of apposition in Virgil seem to require a separate explanation. In Aen. IV 40, *Gaetulae urbes, genus insuperabile bello*, it would be possible to say that *G. u.* = *Gaetuli*; but this will not do for I 339, *finis Libyci, g. i. b.*, where *Libyci* is predicate. Both passages may be explained from the fact that adjective = possessive genitive; the normal form of apposition would be *generis*, but the appositive is attracted by the form of its antecedent. For a somewhat different example of attraction by form prevailing over sense cf. Aen. III 390 ff., *sus triginta capitum fetus enixa iacebit, alba, solo recubans, albi circum ubera nati*. We should expect *albis natis*, since the young, both as a part of the omen and phraseologically after the three modifiers of *sus*, are only an accompaniment and characteristic of the mother; cf. VIII 82, *candida . . . cum fetu concolor albo . . . sus*. But asyndeton = *et* and *et* = *cum*: besides the nominative is the case of enumeration<sup>1</sup> (Gildersleeve, Gr. Synt. §8), and here we have an enumeration of attributes, *enixa, alba, recubans*, to the form of which the substantival attribute adapts itself, because the thought of enumeration has become stronger than that of attribution.

455 manus. To my former remarks on this word (A. J. P. XXV, p. 282), I have to add several passages in which *manus* appears either 1) in a significant conjunction with, or 2) as "a vivid physical substitute for", a word denoting labor: 1) Cic. Off. II 3. 13, N. D. II 60. 151; 2) Lucr. I 209, Cic. Off. I 3. 12, Rep. I 26. 41. The vividness of the substitute is blurred in Cic. Rep. III 9. 15, *Galli turpe esse ducunt frumentum manu quaerere, itaque armati alienos agros demetunt*, since the second action too is manual; it is emphasized by contrast in Verr. III 11. 27, *utrum est aequius . . . eum, qui manu quaesierit, an eum, qui digito sit licitus, possidere*.

W. H. KIRK.

RUTGERS COLLEGE.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Aen. I 639, VIII 678, X 498: passages distinguished from the others cited by Wagner on I 639 by the fact that, like the Greek instances given by Professor Gildersleeve, they show absolute nominatives following on an object accusative,

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Jordan, H., *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum*. Erster Band, Dritte Abtheilung; bearbeitet von Chr. Huelsen. Berlin (Weidmann), 1907; XXIV-709, 11 Plates.

One of the greatest secrets of the strength and virility of German scholarship is its continuity, which in turn owes its presence to the strongly developed sense of "Pietaet", that ancient and mediaeval virtue of loving homage to the master. Those of us who realize its value will be pleased to see that it is still a vital force, and that the intellectual competition of modern Germany, almost as great as its commercial competition, has not caused it to be a discarded virtue. The most recent proof of its vitality is the appearance of what is really Professor Huelsen's own book in the disguised form of Band I, Abtheilung 3 of Heinrich Jordan's *Topographie*.

Some forty years ago Heinrich Jordan, then a young man of about thirty-four, set to work to revise Becker's standard book on Roman topography. Jordan's preliminary researches among mediaeval sources assumed such importance and such bulk that in 1871 they were published as Volume II of his book (Volume I had not yet appeared). Seven years later (1878) the first part of Volume I saw the light. It contained the historical introduction and the general description of the city. Again seven years later (1885) came the second part of Volume I, being the beginning of the detailed description of the various parts of the city. This section dealt with the Capitoline, and the Fora; and Jordan expected at that time to publish within a year the last instalment of Volume I, which was to contain the description of the rest of the city. Before the year had passed, Jordan's work was indeed complete, but it was his life rather than his book which was finished.

In the autumn of 1887 Chr. Huelsen, who had just been appointed Secretary of the German Institute in Rome, undertook the task of writing this last section of Volume I. Today after twenty years delay the missing section appears. Those who know the ceaseless activity of Huelsen, and the value of what he has accomplished both in connection with the Latin Corpus and in the stream of contributions to topography and epigraphy published principally in the *Roemische Mittheilungen* will not wonder at this delay. If they wonder at all, it will be in admiration of the man who was true to his "Pietaetsgefühl" and brought his offering "better late than never". We might almost

say "better late than earlier", considering the infinite value of those occupations which have interrupted him. Nay, some of us may go one step further and admire the sentimental impracticality of publishing the most recent results of topographical research in certain parts of the city as Section 3 of a volume, whose second section, written twenty-two years ago, deals with the remaining portions of the city, and as fate would have it with those portions (the Forum) in which revolutionary progress has been made; and whose first section deals with the general questions of Rome's origin and growth with the handicap of having been written almost a generation ago. Surely this is putting new wine into old bottles! The strangest part of the situation is that to find fault or to criticize would be totally to misunderstand the meaning of 'Pietæ', and to confess oneself a barbarian, devoid of finer feeling. We may consider it a misfortune that it has marred this one book, but we can have only praise for him who has done it, especially as Huelsen's own researches (cp. his articles in the *Roemische Mittheilungen*, and his excellent popular presentation, published in four languages and various editions) on the Forum enable us practically to substitute them for the major part of Section 2. What we really miss therefore and what we certainly have a right to hope for is a general treatment by Huelsen himself—under his own name and unhampered by any limitations except those which he himself has set—of those problems historically most important of all, which concern the origin and the early stages of Rome.

The present section is all of it Huelsen's own work, but though the work itself has been done entirely by him, the limitations are those of Jordan, and this fact makes criticism extremely difficult. In fact the only fundamental wide-reaching criticism against the book which suggests itself to me is scarcely fair under the circumstances, since it concerns a general problem and lay therefore outside Huelsen's task. It is the vital question as to the historical reality of the topographer's beloved scheme of Rome's growth: from *Roma Quadrata*, to the *Septimontium*, to the City of the Four Regions, and so to the Servian Wall. It was not Huelsen's business to enter extensively upon this, and yet it seems as though the chapter on the Palatine ought to contain a footnote referring to what is gradually becoming the accepted view of the new school of Roman history (cp. Degering, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1903, 1645-1646; and Koernemann, *Beitraege zur alten Geschichte*, Bd. V, 1905, p. 89) namely that the first city proper and the first *Pomerium* correspond to what the topographers call the City of the Four Regions, and that preceding this, the so-called *Septimontium*, known to us only in a religious observance, was merely a sacral gathering of the inhabitants of neighbouring villages; and finally that the venerable *Roma Quadrata* never existed as the unique nucleus of Rome, but was merely one of a number of villages on

hilltops along with the Capitoline, the Quirinal, and the Esquiline, and that as a matter of fact any one of the others may well be older than the Palatine.

These questions belong to the topographer quite as much as to the historian, and the fact that Richter in his otherwise admirable book and Huelsen in the present volume largely ignore them may well be merely a part of the weaker side of the heritage of Mommsenism, for Mommsen, infinite as are his deserts in other fields, has brought into vogue a stereotyped view of early Roman history, and an attitude of scepticism about ever knowing much more about it than we know at present (cp. S. Reinach in his *Préface to Modestov's Introduction à l'histoire Romaine*, Paris, 1907) from which only the very modern school of Roman history seems able to emancipate itself, while the majority of investigators in other lines unhesitatingly accept the traditional view.

It is not the place here to enter into a discussion of this particular theory, which is after all merely a theory, but attention is drawn to it in the hope that Professor Huelsen may be tempted to give his view of the matter, for there is scarcely anyone whose opinion would be more worth knowing.

Leaving these general questions and turning to the details of the present volume, one observes with pleasure the dedication to Georg Wissowa, a dedication amplified in the closing paragraph of the preface, and still further borne out by the constant use and quotation of the "Religion und Kultus" in the pages of the book itself. Theoretically this is as it should be, that the one on whom has fallen the mantle of Mommsen, the epigrapher, should co-operate with him who is Mommsen's successor in the field of Roman religion; and practically the gain to topography is immense considering that nine tenths of all the known buildings of the republic are temples. It is to be hoped that Richter in a new edition may follow this leading—in his last edition it was a much more difficult task, because the "Religion und Kultus" had not yet appeared.

The nineteen chapters of the book deal with thirteen of the fourteen regions of the city (Jordan in Section 2 had treated of one region, the eighth). This disposition by regions is to be highly commended. At first sight it seems awkward, even though it was the old method, in comparison with the larger units adopted by Richter and to some extent by Platner. But this awkwardness shows merely our own inability to grasp the ancient city as the Romans knew it. Their division into regions was based on practical and historical considerations, and one of the great aims of our topographical study is to obtain an instinctive familiarity with the regions.

To the average student the most useful part of the book will be the chapter on the Palatine, which may be unhesitatingly characterized as the best account in existence. It is interesting to see the new problematic location of the temple of Jupiter

Stator (pp. 22-23) east instead of west of the arch of Titus; and the denial (p. 44, Anm. 28) of the identity of the Curiae Veteres and the Curiae Saliorum; as well as the acceptance of Maass' theory of the Septizonium = Septizodium (p. 100). On the other hand there are several points which are doubtful. P. 46, it may be questioned whether Noctiluca was ever an *ἐπίκλησις* of Luna, and was not merely a poetical epithet. It is also very questionable whether the rooms under the so-called "Basilica" and "Peristyle" of the Domus Domitiana (p. 90) had anything to do with Augustus. Dr. Van Deman's recent (as yet unpublished) researches seem to disprove any connection. But of course the chief difficulty and the chief interest centre about the western corner. The dispute with Richter regarding the Victoria, Magna Mater, and Juppiter Victor temples still continues. In regard to the Juppiter Victor temple two things ought to be emphasized, first that Huelsen's identification of Juppiter Victor and Juppiter Propugnator (which is also printed on the map) is, so far as any evidence is concerned which I have been able to find, purely arbitrary. Secondly, stripped of Juppiter Propugnator, Juppiter Victor is of no more importance than many other deities for whom we do not feel it necessary to identify temples on the Palatine. Huelsen seems entirely to overlook the temple of Juppiter Victor on the Quirinal, and yet the finding of the archaic inscription (CIL VI 438) on the Quirinal makes it probable, according to the method which Huelsen himself accepts, that of locating temples by the finding of votive inscriptions, that a temple, possibly the great temple (that of Fabius Maximus Rullianus, vowed 295) was located on the Quirinal, and that the majority of references may well be to this temple. That there was however a temple of Juppiter Victor on the Palatine seems clear from the Notitia (the Curiosum omits the cognomen).

Regarding the burning point of the dispute, the location of the Victoria and Magna Mater temples, the logic of the situation seems to be with Huelsen, but the outward appearance of the sites themselves speaks for Richter. There may be room enough for scenic performances in front of the western temple, but certainly the eastern one seems much better adapted to the purpose; and again it seems much more likely that the temple of Victoria would be on the summit of the Palatine rather than half way up the side; the Victoria inscriptions could of course fall down hill. The "Clivus-Victoriae argument" can scarcely be used for either side. Is it possible that Huelsen's great argument, the finding of the torso, etc. of Magna Mater near the western temple, may be explained away as a memorial, perhaps in a chapel of the Victoria temple, to the Great Mother who had passed the first years of her residence in Rome in this very temple before her own was ready for her? If this possibility is admitted, then the greatest argument against Richter would seem to lose its cogency.



Next in interest to the Palatine are the four chapters (19, 20, 21, 22) on the Campus Martius. To any one who has not had the privilege of hearing Huelsen lecture on this subject the chapters will be an unmitigated joy. Those however who have heard those lectures will wish that the treatment had been more similar to that of the lectures, that is to say more strictly chronological. The local divisions into southern, middle, and northern part are difficult to preserve, and they fail to give an adequate idea of the genesis of the Campus Martius, especially of the rise of the suburbs outside of the Porta Carmentalis and the Porta Fontinalis. Incidentally one of these chapters (No. 20) contains several misprints in dates, which I take the liberty of correcting merely because the book is likely to be used by many of our students as an ultimate authority. P. 509, the temple of Juppiter Sospita is said to have been vowed in 197 (Liv. 32, 30, 10) and dedicated "vier Jahre spaeter", that would imply 193. But the Latin is quadriennium (Liv. 34, 53, 3) and means "drei Jahre", i. e. 194, which is actually the year under which Livy mentions it for the second time. P. 514, the great fire occurred in 213 (Liv. 24, 47, 15) not 212; p. 538, Metellus's triumph over Macedonia was in 146 not 149; p. 552, the temple of Bellona was vowed in 296 not 298.

Several other small matters may be worth mentioning: p. 114, the restoration to honour of Venus Obsequens and CIL X 885 and XIV 3569 is very valuable and on this question no one's word is comparable to Huelsen's. P. 115, the location of the temple of Sol outside the "Rennbahn" seems to presuppose that the temple was very old, and to neglect the connection between Sol (the quadriga) and Luna (the biga) and racing. P. 118, note 22, a reference would be in order on the disputed question as to whether the temple of Mercury was round or not. Richter's view that it was (Top. 180) has been refuted by Altmann, *Italische Rundbauten* (p. 21, Berlin, 1906). P. 159, there seems to be a failure to recognize the great age of the Minerva temple and her function as goddess of all handicraftsmen, to whom as a last touch centuries later the "scribae and histriones" were added. P. 522, the temple of Neptune was restored, not built by Ahenobarbus, cp. Liv. 28, 11, 4 in conjunction with Dio Cass. frg. 56, 62 Melb.

As one would expect from Weidmann the book is well printed. The maps however are disappointing, being rather confused and rather curiously cut up (cp. what is perhaps the best of them, No. 1 the Palatine, with the corresponding map in Richter, Taf. 12); it goes without saying that they are nevertheless extremely valuable.

We have every reason to be profoundly grateful for the publication of this book. It is a storehouse of information whose completeness for the parts covered leaves little to be desired. But we are importunate enough to look forward to the day when

Professor Huelsen will present us with a complete topography, aus einem Gusse, whose maps and other accompaniments will be worthy of the words of him who more than any living man has advanced the knowledge of the topography of ancient Rome.

Rome, April, 1907.

JESSE BENEDICT CARTER.

Aegina. Das Heiligtum der Aphaia. Unter Mitwirkung von Ernst R. Fiechter und Hermann Thiersch herausgegeben von ADOLF FURTWÄNGLER, mit 130 Tafeln, 1 Karte, 6 Beilagen und 413 Abbildungen im Text. München, 1906. 2 vols. 4°. Pp. IX, 504.

Among recent archaeological publications this monumental work holds properly a high rank. The treatment of the subject is thorough, and the technical execution, both of text and plates, is excellent. Its appearance so soon after the conclusion of the excavations deserves much commendation and makes the reader lenient in criticism of the many misprints and errors of reference. The lack of an index is less easy to pardon. According to the division of labor among the authors, Fiechter contributes the chapter on architecture, Thiersch has charge of the pottery, bronzes and other smaller finds, while Furtwängler writes the important chapters on the name and sculpture of the sanctuary.

Since the announcements of discoveries, which were published from time to time in the course of the excavations, the name of Aphaia in connection with this temple has become familiar, but a full presentation of the question appears now for the first time. In regard to the deities formerly associated with the sanctuary, mention is made of the recovery of the forged inscription on which rested Cockerell's theory in favor of Zeus Panhellenios, who is thereupon dismissed; but the claims of Athena are discussed at considerable length. Since the time of Ross she has been regarded generally as the Goddess of the temple from the witness of several boundary stones with the inscription ὄρος τεμένους Ἀθηναίας, but Furtwängler shows that only one of these stones was found *in situ* far from the temple and close to the town, while the same inscription is cut in the living rock in a valley on the southern point of the island at the farthest possible distance from the temple. So he is undoubtedly right in declaring that these inscriptions can have no reference to any temple of Athena, but probably come from the time of the Peloponnesian war when the Athenians, after expelling the Aeginetans and settling their island, devoted certain portions of land to their Goddess.

But it is not justifiable to argue against Athena on the ground that as the patron of Athens she was the foe of Aegina. Such an

idea is wholly foreign to the polytheistic religion of the Greeks, who could afford to scorn no God, and in fact indulged in a practice just the opposite of that suggested. Cp. the famous instance in Il. VI 297 ff. The enmity between Athens and Aegina was not *primaeval*, but merely the result of mercantile rivalry beginning in the early sixth century. There is no *a priori* reason why the Aeginetans should not have worshipped Athena ages before that date. There is further not the slightest proof that they regarded her as a foe, but on the contrary we find her mentioned as their friend by Pindar, N. VII 143. The next point against Athena which rests on the silence of Pausanias is hardly more convincing if we remember that such omissions in Pausanias are not rare and that the temple was deserted in Roman times. But Pausanias does in fact mention a sanctuary of Aphaia which he locates on the way to the mountain of Zeus Panhellenios. This description does not fit the position of the present temple, and Furtwängler's suggestion that these two were the only sites worth seeing in the interior of the island and that one therefore was on the way to the other from the visitor's point of view is of course pure assumption. The next argument in favor of Aphaia is startling and shows that the author is willing to resort to extreme measures in order to support his case. In Herodotos III 59 where reference is made to the dedication of certain captured prows *ἐς τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Ἀθηναίης ἐν Αἰγίνῃ* he believes that Ἀφαίης should be substituted for Ἀθηναίης on no other ground apparently than that such a sanctuary of Athena in Aegina is irreconcilable with his theory. These arguments are unconvincing, and Aphaia would not be considered in the matter were it not for the testimony of the inscriptions. In all only eleven were found in the sanctuary, on two of which the name Aphaia is fully preserved, while two others give it in part. The most important is the great archaic inscription which reads: "In the priesthood of Kleoitas the house (*οἶκος*) and the altar were built for Aphaia, the ivory was added and the precinct constructed". This is strong evidence, and yet the arguments for Athena have not been silenced and no word has been said about the statues of Athena found in the precinct. The matter is not yet satisfactorily settled.

We come next to Fiechter's admirable chapter on the architecture of the sanctuary which discusses the measurements and proportions of the earlier buildings as well as those belonging to the fifth century. Particularly instructive are the comparative tables which show at a glance the relation of the present temple to various others of the Doric order in their architectural properties. In this way it is proved that the date of the temple falls between that of the Athenian treasury at Delphi (510-490) and that of the Zeus temple at Olympia (470-457), while the degree of relationship shows that it is nearer to the former than the latter, a view which is substantiated by the style of the sculpture.

Very ingenious is Fiechter's explanation of the fact that all the columns of the peristasis are monoliths with the exception of three on the north side. Here was the best approach for the conveyance of the massive architectural members, and therefore the great monoliths were placed on the stylobate, and the cella walls were raised to an equal height before the opening on the north was closed. As there was no longer room for handling monoliths the final columns were constructed of drums. Another interesting detail of the building is the presence of a door in the west cella wall connecting the temple hall proper with the opisthodomos, where there is a stone table which would indicate that the opisthodomos was also used for sacrificial purposes. On the cella floor were found marks of the basis of the cult statue, which show that it was a small and probably seated figure, but give no further clue toward its identification. As no piece of the metopes was found, it is reasonable to accept the view that they were constructed of wood.

The heart of the book is devoted to the treatment of the sculpture which was the primary cause which led to the present excavations whose most conspicuous success rests on the light thrown by the new fragments on the existing groups. Beside the pieces of sculpture a few blocks of the floor of the pediment were found, which show the marks where the plinths of the statues were placed and thus furnish important evidence for the new arrangement. Furtwängler begins the chapter with a brief sketch of the history of the marbles referring to his *Beschreibung der Glyptothek* in Munich (1900) for all details. They were discovered by Cockerell and von Haller in 1811, and through a misunderstanding on the part of the English, were purchased by Bavaria, and after restorations had been made by Thorwaldsen were deposited at Munich in 1828. The new reconstruction rests on the recent discoveries, on the original notes of Cockerell and von Haller, and on a close study of the weathering of the marble. Its most important element is the determination of the position of a group of combatants on either side of Athena instead of the group in the centre which has hitherto been assumed as fixed. The discovery under the south half of the west pediment of a right hand holding a stone which lies on a block is an indication of the presence of a fourth fallen man in that pediment. This is further supported by the marks in a block of the pedimental geison of the west front which show a compact group of three persons, two facing each other over a third between. And finally, the necessary four combatants are supplied by the observation that the head on a fallen figure in the Glyptothek has a helmet with an ancient cutting at the top in proof that it belonged to a figure standing under the right slope of the pediment roof and that it was turned to the left. The warrior preserved, who is rightly turned to the left, as the weathering shows, has his original head; and hence there were two combatants turned to the left who demand



two opponents. Thus this grouping is well attested for the west pediment and while, as Furtwängler says, a similar arrangement is probable for the east, there is slight evidence for it.

Of the other figures in the west pediment there is a shifting of position in the case of each pair. Those in the corners exchange places because immediately under the south corner a right lower leg was found and identified as the piece missing from the figure in the Glyptothek which has always been placed in the opposite end. The new position agrees with Cockerell's original drawing which was made at the time and based on the place of discovery. The position of the next figure is fixed on the north side since a piece of the left leg and the left arm were found under that end and it was thus placed by Cockerell. The upright combatant is moved from the right to the left side and the bowmen exchange places on the witness of Cockerell alone. In the case of the bowmen the weathering proves that they were headed toward the corners, while those in the east pediment are shown in the earliest sketches as facing the centre. Again on the testimony of Cockerell the corner men in the east have their feet toward the corner, and the so-called "Zugreifender" in each case occupies the third place from Athena.

Such in outline is the new reconstruction which is final as far as it is based on facts though it may be doubted if it is legitimate to lay so much weight on the position reported by Cockerell. The main difference between the pediments is that there are two distinct groups on either side of Athena in the west in contrast to the single group in the east. The arrangement in the west is well supported and fairly satisfactory but in the east it rests chiefly on theory and is not convincing in all details. In the general style and execution of the individual figures the west pediment is more archaic than the east, which leads Furtwängler to the belief that the sculptures are the work of two different artists.

In addition to these works the new excavations have brought out the remarkable fact that the sanctuary contained another series of sculptures showing the hand of several other artists. Thirty-eight fragments were found on the east terrace of the precinct which indicate that there were other warriors very similar to those in the pediments in style, size, plan and conception, which yet could not have been in the pediments. There were found also pieces belonging to a third Athena and fragments of a third akroterion. As there is no building to which they could belong Furtwängler maintains that they were made in competition with those finally accepted for the temple and later bought and dedicated in the sanctuary, where there are great foundations on either side of the altar. This is a startling idea and it is hardly a comfortable parallel to refer to the Amazon statues bought after competition by the fabulously wealthy sanctuary of the Ephesian Artemis. Beside a slight difference in style the fragments are too numerous to be assigned to the pedimental groups, but there



is no proof to support the theory suggested. Further it is clear that in the position he selects the author himself furnishes an argument against the Aphaia theory, for no self-respecting Goddess would allow a hostile Athena to stand directly over her altar.

On the interpretation of the sculpture and the meaning of the groups the traditional view has been largely followed. Apart from the central figure in each group, Athena, the only member that can be identified is Herakles in the east pediment, who, though without the lion's skin, wears its head on his helmet. The statement that this representation of Herakles and a similar figure on a metope of the Athenian treasury at Delphi are the only examples of such representation in the whole realm of ancient art is distinctly extravagant in view of the vase at Bonn and the other instances cited by Körte (*Arch. Jahrb.* VII, p. 68 and VIII *Arch. Anz.*, p. 199), which at least leave the question an open one. A new interpretation is given to the so-called "Zugreifender". The discovery of his original arm which held a helmet and was raised at a different angle to the body, together with an examination of the evidence literary and monumental, has led Furtwängler to the conclusion that these figures are not there to seize the fallen body but are squires (*ὑπηρέται*), bearing the extra weapons of the master. But as the group arrangement of the east pediment is based only on theory any attempt to explain this puzzling figure seems futile. Athena, the dominating figure in each group, is declared by the author to have no relation to the temple but to be present only as the Goddess of battle (p. 310). This is surprising when taken in connection with the description of her as the foe of Aegina and inconsistent with the custom of representing the deity in the sculpture which was followed without exception in temples of the fifth century as far as our limited knowledge goes (see A. J. A. VIII, p. 18 ff.). If Furtwängler's arguments are sound, Athena is the most inappropriate deity that could have been placed in these pediments.

In his discussion of the position of the sculptures in the history of art our author is very successful, and we have interesting and instructive chapters on the development of pedimental sculpture in general, which our modern artists might study with much profit, the relation of the Aegina works to the vase paintings and their close connection with the Samian school of art. This last point is emphasized in an effort to prove that there was a school of marble sculpture in Aegina which was strongly influenced by the Samian artists. But it is remarkable that no word is said of the unmistakable signs of bronze influence on the statues themselves in view of the bronze tradition for which the island is famous.

The painting of the sculpture is treated at some length but without satisfactory result. From the few traces of color which remain Furtwängler argues that only two colors, red and blue, were used with perhaps the merest touch of gold for occasional contrast on a blue ground. As the works on the Akropolis show green and

yellow this does not seem very probable, but the theory is not as shocking as are the shades of red and blue which are selected. The whole matter is of course largely subjective and allowance must be made for the difficulty of reproducing on plates the colors of the models, but still the result is inconceivably harsh. Perhaps the most distressing detail is the Athena of the east pediment. Here Furtwängler in defiance of accepted theory and precedent paints the linen Ionian himation a single color, deep red, because there was found a small fragment of the lower edge of the back of the garment that was painted red. The author passes lightly over the aversion of the Greeks to paint completely large surfaces of their Parian marble and is little troubled by the fact that no Akropolis maiden shows any such himation, but rests his case on the parallel with the Apollo in Olympia whose mantle is painted red. This fact is mentioned several times, but it seems strange to compare the bit of color on the Apollo which was added only to break the glare of the marble with the great mass of Athena's garment. Further, there is too great a contrast between this figure and all the other female figures on the temple to whom are given garments painted like those of the Akropolis maidens in borders and rosettes. No one will disagree with Furtwängler in his declaration (p. 304) of the great need that is now felt for a satisfactory work on polychromy in Greek sculpture.

Among the briefer chapters, contributed by Thiersch, those on bronzes and on vases must be mentioned on account of their importance and the excellent way in which they are treated. Because of the division of labor it is inevitable that there should be some disagreement among the authors which makes some passages inconsistent with others. So, for example, we read in the last chapter (p. 490) that a view expressed by Fiechter in the early part of the work is false. Now Thiersch, agreeing with the common belief that there was a famous bronze school in Aegina, is surprised that no large bronzes and few small images even were found in the sanctuary. This fact leads him to the conclusion that it was an "ärmliches Landheiligtum", a view which is hard to reconcile with Furtwängler's description of a great national sanctuary in which captured prows would be dedicated and treasure stored, and which could buy numerous pedimental statues not needed for the temple. Most of the bronzes found are articles for personal use and adornment, such as rings, pins, mirrors, knives, nails, etc., and of these by far the largest group is that of the pins used for fastening garments. This has led Thiersch to give a sketch of the history of the use of these pins from the early type of the straight stick pin to its gradual development into the fibula. It is an important study, but there is one point which should be criticised. Thiersch advances the theory that these pins were not dedicated alone but together with the garments in which they were used. But Herodotos (V 88) says that Aeginetan women dedicated chiefly

clothing pins to a particular sanctuary after the Athenian women had stabbed to death the sole survivor of the Aeginetan expedition, and there is a verification of this in the inventory of the treasure of the temple of Mnia and Auzesia which mentions over three hundred pins and then states that a few (thirteen in all) were dedicated on the garments. There is no reason for assuming a greater proportion in the case of other sanctuaries.

The chapter on vases is little more than a catalogue, as Furtwängler reserves the material for his own use in reconstructing the history of the sanctuary. They begin with the late Mycenaean period, ca. 1200, and practically cease with the Attic ware. The large number of groups represented is proof of the great mercantile activity of the people of the island. One point that should be mentioned, on which there is again a difference of opinion between Furtwängler and Thiersch, is in regard to the home of the Proto-Corinthian class. Both of the authors reject Professor Hoppin's theory expressed in the Argive Heraeum and Thiersch thinks that Aegina itself as well as Sikyon may be suggested as the place. The claims of Aegina, however, are denied by Furtwängler in his concluding chapter, who believes with Dragendorff that the greatest evidence now is in favor of Sikyon. But cp. A. J. P. XXVI, p. 465.

The last chapter, the history of the sanctuary by Furtwängler, is to some extent a summary of what has preceded. Worship on the site was begun about 1200 B. C. but no building of any kind was erected until the second half of the seventh century. This temple was superseded by a larger one in the first third of the sixth century which was burned perhaps by the Persians, and the great new building was constructed between 490 and 480. The cult declined rapidly in the Hellenistic age and in Roman times the sanctuary was totally deserted. This is an interesting section and a notable illustration of the information that can be gleaned by the expert from a careful excavation and exact study of successive deposits of pottery, of innumerable dedications and of architectural remains.

The book is the complete final publication of an archaeological unit, and in spite of some points that are open to criticism, is a brilliant and inspiring work of the highest value not only to artists and archaeologists but to all students of classical antiquity.

T. L. SHEAR.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

## REPORTS.

### ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK, VOL. IX. Second Half.

Pp. 353-354. E. Wölfflin, *Das Adverbium recens*. Recenter and recente are late and rare. Cases of recens in which the word may not be taken as an adj. are very scarce. The passage recens scrip. cited by Charisius, p. 216. 28 K is doubtful, since scrip. may stand for scripsit (= conscripsit) a usage found in Sall. and imitated by Julius Valerius. Another reminiscence of Sallust in Valerius is found on p. 30. 3 Kübler = 1. 20.

354. E. Wölfflin, *Suilla*. Sulla. The diminutive suilla (caro), beside porcina, bubula, etc., is first found in Varro, LL. 5. 108, an example which is not cited by the lexicons. The diminutive may be due to the fondness of the Romans for that meat. Suilla may also be the correct reading in a speech of C. Gracchus cited by Charisius, 197. 27 K. The suggestion is made that the personal name Sulla is derived from suilla rather than from sura.

355-446. G. Landgraf, *Glossographie und Wörterbuch*. An examination of the material in the fourth and fifth volume of the CGL. with reference to its use in the lexicons. Careful consideration of each case is necessary, since many apparently archaic or vulgar forms are mere errors of copyists, while on the other hand genuine words may be recovered from such erroneous forms. After illustrating these points by examples, the writer considers a large number of glosses in alphabetical order with the result of finding many new words and rare forms. An index follows of the words not treated in alphabetical order.

446. G. Landgraf, *Die Accusativform inguinem bei Ennius*. An example from Ennius in Corp. Gloss. V. 581. Also two others from the Corp. Gloss.

447-452. E. Wölfflin, *Die Lokalsätze im Lateinischen*. An examination of the various forms of these clauses. The mood is the indicative, except in the indefinite second person singular, but in silver Latin the subjunctive is used of repeated action and in late Latin without discrimination.

453-457. O. Hey, *Accessus*. Accido. Lexicon articles.

458. E. Wölfflin, *Der generelle Plural der Eigennamen*. This is mostly found in cases and declensions where no ambiguity is possible, thus Camillos and Scipionibus but not Catilinae. Exceptions occur especially in Greek names.

459-463. Miscellen. O. Hey, Acessio—acessus. Explanatory notes to the lexicon article on pp. 453-457.

E. Lattes, Hirquitallus. Formed from \*hirquita, fem. of hircuus, hircus (cf. Neverita, ALL. VIII. 496). Would class these words with Geneta, Moneta, etc., and derive from nomina agentis gene-, mone-, etc. which are lost in Latin but occur in some cases in the other Italic Dialects.

J. v. d. Vliet, Compilare. Concipilare. Examples of the confusion of these two words, the former in the sense of verberare, with notes on some passages in Apuleius.

F. Abbott, Valde in den Briefen an Cicero. The fact that valde occurs in many of the correspondents of Cicero makes it improbable that its use was due to imitation, but suggests that the usage existed in the sermo cottidianus of educated men of Cicero's time and was introduced into literature (rhetorical and philosophical works) by him.

C. W., Decies milies. A note on the article in ALL. IX. 177 fol.

464-480. Review of the Literature for 1894 and 1895.

481. Bericht der Kommission für den Thesaurus Linguae Latinae über die Pfingstkonzferenz zu München, 3 und 4 Juni, 1895.

484. E. Wölfflin. An appeal for special lexicons to the authors after Tacitus.

485-491. H. Blase, Amabo. Amplification and correction of the treatment of this phrase in the lexicons. The formula belongs to the everyday language of early times and is found especially in comedy. It was joined paratactically to an imperative clause, without restriction as to word order, and by ellipsis of a verb of saying to an interrogative sentence. It was at first volitive, then by omission of the second personal pronoun became equivalent to "please". It is usually uttered by women to men. Plautus uses it seldom of men to women and generally for comic effect; only once of a man to a man. Cicero adopted the phrase in his letters, but without regard to the limitations in its use. He therefore differs in some particulars from the usage of early Latin.

492. E. Wölfflin, Est invenire. This phrase is the equivalent of the Greek *ἔστιν εὑρεῖν* and is found especially in writers influenced by Greek. Est videre, on the other hand, is preferred in prose, is earlier, and is not of Greek origin. *ἔστιν εἰπεῖν* is seldom or never translated into Latin. Examples of est videre are given additional to those cited in ALL. II. 133 fol. The earliest example of a deponent inf. in such a phrase appears to be magis sit opinari quam scire in Cic. ad Att. 9. 7<sup>d</sup>. 2 (Balbus).

492. C. W., Infinitiv auf -uiri bei Augustinus. In Epist. XXVIII. 4. 6, p. 112. 13 Goldbacher, prosperat uiri of cod. Pari-



sinus (fourth century) should be written prosperatui. G. reads prosperatum iri.

493-521. E. Wölfflin, *Die Latinität des Benedikt von Nursia*. The *Regula Monachorum* of Benedict of Nursia is especially adapted to give testimony to the Latinity of his period (6th century) because it appears in MSS of the 7th, 8th, and 9th centuries. The work is subjected by the writer to a careful examination, under the usual heads. The first edition of the work, best preserved in cod. Oxoniensis, gives us the natural language of Benedict, unaffected by classical influences, that is to say, the popular language of the day.

521. E. Wölfflin, *Redaedifico in der lex Ursonensis*. An example in tab. 2, line 20, where the stone has *redaedicaturum*.

522. E. Wölfflin, *Inauratura*. An example of this word in Cantor's edition of the *Agrimensores* (Leipzig, 1875, p. 213, § 25) in the sense of the surface of a sphere. The word is used later in a technical sense in the writers on geometry.

522. E. Wölfflin, *Didascalia apostolorum*. Vulgar and rare words from this work (4th century) of which fragments were discovered by Hauler and Studemund in cod. palimpsest. Veron. LV (53).

523-526. L. Havet, *Vulba*. *Viuenta*, *buuile*, *rauula*, *rauilla*. These words, of which the correct spelling is given in the title, are misspelled in modern times, through errors arising from the confusion of b and consonant u in later Latin.

527-545. E. Wölfflin, *Das Duodecimalsystem mit den Probeartikel duodecim und sexaginta*. The contest between the system of reckoning by decades and the duodecimal system began in pre-literary times and in the classical period both existed side by side. The writer regards the decimal system as the older. An examination of the uses of duodecim and sexaginta and variations on these is followed by lexicon articles on the two numerals.

546. C. W., *Glossographisches zu Archiv IX*. 355 fol. Some notes on the article of Landgraf.

547-548. O. Schwabe, *Zwei unedierte Deklamationen des Calpurnius Flaccus*. These are found in the cod. Chigianus (H VIII 261), but are not found in the edition of Burmann nor in cod. Monac. 309. The first forms the conclusion to Burmann's 31 and the beginning of a new declamation, the conclusion of which is the present conclusion of Burmann's 31. The second is a new declamation inserted between 43 and 44.

549-565. G. Landgraf, *Ueber die Latinität des Horazscholasten Porphyrio*. Porphyrio shows characteristics of African Latin corresponding with that of the earlier African writers, Apuleius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius and Lactantius, as well

of the earlier translations of the Bible. Hence the assignment of his life to the first half of the third century is made very probable.

565. G. Landgraf, Zu S. 355 ff. "Glossographie und Wörterbuch". Corrections furnished by Schmitz and Stowasser.

566. G. Landgraf, Quocirca, idcirco, quapropter. Quocirca appears first in Varro, who is followed by Cicero, while Caesar avoids the word. Idcirco occurs in Plautus and Terence and is used twice by Caesar, once in the Bell. Gall. It is found once in Sall., and more frequently in Cic. Quapropter, which is found in early Latin poetry and was introduced into prose by the Auct. ad Herennium, is also most frequent in Cicero. It is not used by Caesar.

567-573. E. Wölfflin, Zur Alliteration. Notes on the principles of the subject, suggested by O. Keller's Grammatische Aufsätze (Leipzig, 1895) pp. 1-72. In Greek alliteration is practically unknown, on account of the accentual system of the language. In Latin not a few cases of so-called alliteration are due to chance, as Venus Victrix beside numerous unalliterative epithets, and more maiorum, where no other choice of words is possible; cf. on the other hand Venus volgivaga (Lucr.). Praenomina are often chosen for alliterative effect, but in the case of names the alliteration is often accidental, as in Cato Censorinus, Metellus Macedonicus, etc. In the case of words compounded with prepositions the alliteration is not always with the preposition, as Keller maintains. Alliteration of aspirates with *tenuēs* is found in the period when the aspirates did not exist in Latin and also in later times. Occasionally *tenuēs* and *mediae* are found in alliterative relations, as *carus* and *gratus*, *cor* and *genium*, and also two or more consonants at the beginning of a word. Anaphora must be distinguished from alliteration. The latter is not common in compound words, on account of the rarity of these in Latin, and where it is found, it is not easy to say whether it is accidental or intentional. The same thing is true of formulas like *ex senati sententia*. The signification of a word is sometimes affected through its use in alliterative combinations, for example *vanus* (cf. *vacuus*) through contrast with *verus*. Alliteration is most frequent in early Latin, while alliteration of three or more words is rare in prose. Complete lines in which each word begins with the same letter are found as early as Naevius.

574. E. Wölfflin, Zum S. C. de Bacanalibus. *Magister* (line 10) is epicene. *Magistra* is found first in Terence. In line 12 *quisquam* should be read instead of *quiquam*.

574. E. Wölfflin, *Convivalis*. *Convivalis*. The former is derived from *conviva* or *convivo* contrary to the statements of Forcellini, Klotz and Georges, the latter only from *convivium*. The former is not found earlier than Livy, and the examples of the latter are for the most part doubtful or false.

575-577. O. Hey, *Accidens-Accidentia*. Lexicon articles.

577. P. Geyer, *Männliche Verbalsubstantiva mit dem Casus des Verbums*. In the *Passio Perpetuae*, p. 62. 5 (ed. of Armitage Robinson, Cambridge, 1891) *cod. Casinensis* gives *administratur* which should be retained as a noun of agency (cf. French nouns in *-teur*) or altered to *administrator*. Other examples of such nouns with objects are cited from late Latin.

578. E. Lattes, *Faluppas*. The existence of this word in Latin is shown by *Ital. faloppa* (cf. *ALL. IX. 416, 445*).

578. J. H. Schmalz, *Sorte ductus*. The earliest example of this phrase is found in *Cic. De Rep. 1. 51*. It is first cited by the lexicons from Sallust. The original construction must have been *sortem ducere*.

579-585. E. Wölfflin, *Accidia—accludo*. Lexicon articles.

585. A. Sonny, *Ortus = Quelle*. An example from Avienus, *Or. Marit. 61*.

586. P. Geyer, *Oratio = Gebet*. This meaning, which is found in Tertullian, is doubtful for Minucius Felix.

586. E. Wölfflin, *Accieo*. Would read this word in *Sen. Thyest. 983*. Other examples.

587-591. A. Funck, *Accipiter. Acclamatio. Acclamo*. Lexicon articles.

591-592. A. Zimmermann, *Dunc. Quandon?* Two new instances of the former (*CIL. VI. 11252* and *18086*). The latter, which is parallel to *donecum*, appears in *CIL. VI. 22275, 25905, 27546, 29910*, and in *Orelli, II. c. XX. 4374*.

592. A. Zimmermann, *Lateinische Tiernamen aus Menschennamen*. This usage, familiar in German, is found also in Latin. Some examples are given.

593-599. Miscellen. K. Dziatzko, *Zu den Helmstedter Glossarfragmenten*. Corrections of the publication of these in *CGL. II. 559 ff.*

W. Heraeus, *Zu Keils Juvenal-Glossen*. Some additions to these (*CGL. V. 652 ff.*) as well as some from Horace and Persius. *Imaguncula* (*icuncula, plaguncula*). Additional examples of the first. The other two words have no place in the lexicons. *Primum pilum deducere*. This phrase occurs occasionally as a variant reading for *primum pilum ducere*. The word-play in *Ovid, Amor. 3. 8. 27 proque bono versu primum deducite pilum* suggests that it may be the correct reading in some cases. *Pædidus*. The examples of the word cited by the lexicons are doubtful. A genuine instance in *Apul. Met. 5. 10. Oculis contrectare*. Some additional examples. The use of the phrase in *Lact. Opif. D. 1. 15* is unique in not being used of lascivious

glances. *Milia* mit dem Genetiv. Additional instances. The usage appears first apparently in Lucilius. Verg. Aen. 1. 491 *mediis* in *milibus* ardet and Hor. Sat. 1. 6. 111 *milibus aliis* are bold uses which do not seem to be paralleled elsewhere. *Praeverto* und *praevertor*. The former in the sense of 'prefer' in a fragment of Sallust in CGL. V. 136. 23. The perfect of the latter (contrary to Georges) in Fronto, 129 N.

W. M. Lindsay, *Spätlateinische Randglossen* in Nonius. The cod. Harleianus contains two series of glosses, of which one is not known from other sources. Some examples of these are given. M. Bréal, *Stantes Missi*. In this phrase, which occurs in two inscriptions, the meaning is "liberty to the victor" and *stantes* (*stans*) is the opposite of *cadere*, *succumbere*.

600-623. Review of the Literature for 1895.

623-625. Necrology. Karl Ernst Georges and Martin Hertz, by the Editor.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

PHILOLOGUS, LXV (N. F. Bd. XIX), 1906.

I, pp. 1-23. O. Immisch, *Ein Gedicht des Aristoteles*. (Fr. Aristot. 673 Rose ed. min.) Summary on p. 12: Aristotle is the donor of the altar which stood by Plato's tomb. The inscription has come down to us. Aristotle himself has told us about it in a poem to the Rhodian Eudemos. Into it he has inserted the pentameter of the inscription without change. Olympiodoros knows of the poem, the others of the distich alone; only in the *Vita Marciana* is any allusion recognizable to the poem. Immisch proposes *εὐσεβέων σεμνήν φίλιν* in vs. 2 and *οὐδ' ἐν* in the last.

II, pp. 24-90. A. Roemer, *Zur Würdigung und Kritik der Tragikerscholien*. An attempt to sift and test by various norms the material offered by the scholiasts. 1. Comparison of our sources. 2. The plan of the *ὑπομνήματα* of the Alexandrine philologists on the Greek dramatists. 3. Treatment of Mythology in the scholia to the tragedians. 4. The same in later time. 5. Contradictions and attempts at harmonizing. 6. The critics of Euripides and the Sophocles-enthusiasts. 7. Treatment of dramaturgy by the ancient commentators. 8. The *διδόμοι* (the *περίπατοι*) of Euripides. 9. Estimate of *πιθανότης*. 10. The problem of morality. 11. Scenic questions. 12. Homeric citations. 13. Principles of this spurious philology.

III, pp. 91-96. A. Holder, *Zu Avianus*. Collation of the Reichenauer Codex LXXIII at Karlsruhe, saec. X.

IV, pp. 97-127. A. Klotz, *Ueber die Expositio totius Mundi et gentium*. Over against Sinko, A. L. L. XIII, 1904, p. 531-574, Klotz maintains (p. 114) that the work is a translation from the Greek, as has generally been accepted.

V, pp. 128-141. W. Dörpfeld, *Alt-Athen zur Königszeit*. Reply to E. Drerup, *Philol.* (1905, p. 66 ff.) on the Pelargikon, the Pnyx and Thukydides' testimony as to the oldest Polis. Page 138-141 D. summarizes his views given at length before in *Athen, Mitt.* 1895, p. 189 ff.; *Rh. Mus.*, 1896, p. 127 ff. At the time of the Kings Athens was a fortified castle, whose wall had been built by the ancient Pelasgians. The citadel consisted of an upper and a lower fort, which were still extant at the time of the Persian war. Themistokles substituted for the lower fort a new fortified lower-city. The big lower-city now became the new Polis, the enclosed part of the ancient Polis, the acropolis. The shrines originally lay only inside the citadel as far as there was room; those outside were close to the gate on the slope of the hill. Just outside the gate was the spring Kalirrhoe.

VI, pp. 142-153. L. Radermacher, *Griechischer Sprachbrauch* (cf. *Philol.* LXIII. 1), cites an additional reason for athetizing Eurip. *Elektra* 17, and for reading *οιοπολῶν* in *Kyklops* 74,—namely a characteristic ellipsis. In *Ion*. 98 f. *ιδίᾱς* is supported by the usage in Demosthenes *adv. Mid.* 52. The words *κειρία*, *ὑμνος* (in late writers = sermon), *περίοδος* (in Dion. of H. as 'strophe').

#### Miscellen.

1. pp. 154-156. M. Wundt, *Antigone* v. 569. The allusion is to dowry; *γύης* refers to a landed estate.

2. pp. 156-157. K. Horna, *Kritische Miscellen zu Plato. Laches*, 187.

3. pp. 157-159. R. Reitzenstein, *Zu Laevius*. Laevius at the close of his *Erotopaignia* had a poem to Venus in the form of a *Pterygion Phoenicis*. In this he imitated the "Wing of Eros" of Simmias, which without serving any real mystical purpose dealt with mystical representations.

4. pp. 159-160. O. Crusius, *Alpheus-Olphius* (*Martial IX.* 95). The pun is on the phrase alpha-omega, the first and the last.

5. p. 160. O. Crusius, *ΓΕΡΡΑ ΝΑΞΙΑ*, a pun, either *γέρρα* *Νάξια* or *γέρρ'* *ἀνάξια* ("worthless jokes").

VII, pp. 161-192. C. Hentze, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Finalsätze auf Grund der homerischen Epen*. An examination of (1) the final use of the infinitive. (2) the future participle. (3) *μή* clauses with subj. and cases of parataxis. (4) *ᾗ* compared with *ἵνα*. (5) explanation of the final use of *ᾗ* from the temporal use. (6) *ἵνα* (never with *κέν* or *ἄν*), and most frequently with *μή*. 7. Final use of *ὥς* (without *κί* or *ἄν*). 8. *ὅπως*. 9. *ἕως* (*Odys.* alone). 10. From this usage the following results are found (p. 192). Books B-I agree with the accepted later books of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; whereas *ΑΔΙΧ* belong to an early age.

VIII, pp. 193-247. D. Müllder, *Analyse des Zwölften und Zehnten Buches der Odyssee*. After laying down his principles



of investigation, M. treats successively of the motive of Helios' Wrath; Circe's instruction to Odysseus; the ancient ground-work (a) the lay of the Sirens; (b) Skylla and Charybdis; (c) the adventure on Thrinakia. 5. The Circe-lay. 6. Character and tendency of the revision. General summary of results, p. 246-247, in  $\iota$ ,  $\kappa$ ,  $\mu$  there are two different strata of tradition, an older stratum, over which rests and into which occasionally enters the later elaborate revision of the poet of our Odyssey. In this ancient stratum there is nothing Trojan or Heroic, nothing specifically 'Homeric.' It would seem more likely that an older work of different sort had been adapted by the poet of the Odyssey.

IX, pp. 248-282. S. Eitrem, Der homerische Hymnus an Hermes. The results of the analysis are given on p. 282. Many paths lead us to Attika and the century of the great tragedians for the place and time of the origin of this hymn. The occasion was probably the feast of the *τετραδισταί*. There is no deeper religious significance in the poem.

X, pp. 283-288. L. Erhardt, Zum Text von Tacitus' Germania. Emendations to the text as given in Müllenhoff's edition. C. 8 would retain *nobiles* of the MSS; so c. 30 he would retain *Romanae* (for *ratione*); in c. 23 he reads *vincerentur*; c. 45 *degenerarunt*; in c. 37 would omit *et ipso et ipse*, and in c. 4 omit *aliarum nationum*.

XI, pp. 289-306. A. Müller, Exkurs zu Tacitus' Histor. I 46. On the authority of centurions to grant furloughs to the private soldiers (the right belonged to independent commanders only), on the remission of munera or munia; the decree of Otho to pay from the *fiscus vacationes annuae* of the centurions; on the *stellatura*, etc.

XII, pp. 307-316. Th. Stangl, Sprachliches zu Florus 'Vergilius orator an poeta.'

#### Miscellen.

6. pp. 317-318. J. Baunack, *ἀμαρα* = sincere.

7. p. 318. H. Deiter, Zu Cicero pro Roscio Amerino 5, 11 reads *e . . . dimittendis suis*.

8. pp. 318-319. H. Deiter, Kritische Bemerkungen zu Ciceros philosophischen Schriften.

9. p. 320. Cr. Analogien zur homerischen Skylla in der mykenischen Kunst.

XIII, pp. 321-356. A. v. Domaszewski, Beiträge zur Kaisergeschichte. 1. The Dacian wars of Trajan on the reliefs of the Column. 2. Aristides' Speech *εἰς βασιλέα* (35 Keil=9 Dind.). It is by the Athenian Sophist Callinicus of Petra, the *προσφωνητικὸς Γαλιηνῶ*.

IV, pp. 357-381. M. Wundt, Die Schlusscene der Sieben gegen Theben. An argument for the genuineness of the scene.

It is an anachronism. There can be no doubt that the fight over the burial of the traitor Polyneikes possessed a very real interest at that time. The question was, was Polyneikes really a traitor? Whether he ought not to have yielded to his foes, while the gods of his home remained propitious to him.

XV, pp. 382-387. L. Gurlitt, Timotheos und sein Gedicht zu Ehren der Opis zu Ephesos. In Macrob. Sat. V. 22, 4 in the second Greek pentameter read χρυσείων δέκ' ἐπὼν δὴ τότε χιλιάδα. The sum received was 10 gold shekels.

XVI, pp. 388-396. A. Körte, Zum attischen Erbrecht. The grandfather could prefer his grandchildren before his nephews—he had only to adopt them, but this he did not do in Isaïos VIII, 36.

XVII, pp. 397-409. K. Linde, Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik des Platonischen Phädon. I. Cases where the MS authority is kept. II. Lacunae. III. Interpolations.

XVIII, pp. 410-424. R. Asmus, Vergessene Physiognomonika. In Vol. II of the *Scriptores physiognomonici*, p. 233 f. Förster in his *Sylloge locorum physiognomonicorum* omits some passages relating to the emperor Julian of interest partly for the knowledge of his person, partly for the interpretation of his writings. I. The portrait of Julian in Gregorius Nazianzenus. II. The love-sick Antiochus in Misopogon, pp. 447-8. III. Diodoros of Antioch. IV. Racial types. V. The Jews.

XIX, pp. 425-463. R. Hildebrandt, Rhetorische Hydraulik. An attempt to obtain from poetic and rhetorical sources new light on the subject of the water-organ, and at the same time to discover how close the several writers kept to the well-known principles of *ἐκφρασις*.

XX, pp. 464-471. J. Oeri, Oberrheinisches bei Horaz. The person referred to in Hor. Sat. I. 10, 35; II. 5, 40 and *ars poet.* 14 ff. is taken to be a Furius (different from Furius of Antium and Furius Bibaculus) from Cisalpine Gaul, who is here said to have written a description of the course of the Rhine from its Alpine source, which would suit all the passages.

#### Miscellen.

10. pp. 472-474. K. Lincke, Zu Parmenides *περὶ φύσεως*, v. 31 f. reads *χρή' ὑδυκέως*.

11. pp. 474-475. J. Baunack, Zur ältesten Grabinschrift aus der Megaris. In the *insc. publ.* by Wilhelm, Athen. Mitt. XXXI (1906), 89-93, read *ἐλπίδες* for *ἐνπίδες*.

12 pp. 475-477. F. Hommel, Zu Uranios und Glaukos. Glaukos wrote about 200 A. D., hardly later, in case he was not a contemporary of Ptolemy. Uranios is at the earliest to be placed in the fourth century.

13. p. 478. A. Zimmermann, Randglossen. Other instances like Alfius-Olphius are discussed (cf. above, p. 159 f.). The latter is a case where for purposes of derision a Roman name is grecized.

14. pp. 478-480. M. Manitius, Dresdener Priscian Fragmente.

XXI, pp. 481-489. L. Büchner, Hafen Panormos und Vorgebirg Palinuros auf der Insel Samos. Livy's Panormus Samiae terrae is the harbor of Wathy and the promontory "Palinurus" is Domús Burnú.

XXII, pp. 490-544. M. Mayer, Zur Topographie und Urgeschichte Apuliens. 1. Pliny's description of Apulia needs careful textual revision, and must in any case be used with great caution. 2. Topographical studies. 3. The oldest Japygian cities and tribes. 4. The alleged Italic elements among the Japygians.

XXIV, pp. 545-557. W. Nestle, Der Dualismus des Empedokles. We find in E. a dualism carried out logically, on the one hand, the world of matter in eternal change through mingling and separating of the elements according to mechanical laws; and on the other, the incorporeal world of spirits. It differs from Plato's in that in the former matter is of more importance, and is the object of serious empirical investigation.

XXV, pp. 558-566. W. Schmid, Uebersehenes Citat eines griechischen Troiaromans, Synesios (Encom. calv. 19, p. 1197 D. Migne). It is traced back to Dares; if this is not accepted it would at any rate go back to a Greek Dictys.

XXVI, pp. 567-603. M. Rabenhorst, Die Indices auctorum und die wirklichen Quellen der Naturalis historia des Plinius. (Study of the sources of the N. H. part two). Brunn's law does not hold that the citations of authors are as a rule made in the same order as their names appear in the *indices*. R. holds that Pliny made these indices in order to give the appearance of erudition and also to make it as difficult as possible to check his use of his chief sources. These chief sources date from the early empire, not from the republic.

XXVII, pp. 604-629. Th. Zielinski, Textkritik und Rhythmusgesetz in Ciceros Reden. Examination of 39 passages from the Pompeiana. The rejected M is shown to be one of the best MSS.

XXVIII, pp. 630-636. R. Herzog, Dorier und Ionier (on IG. XII. 5, 225) emends the inscription, ἀκούρηι and δούλωι. The long hair is taken to be in contrast to the Dorians. Foreigners and slaves were kept from participation in the religious worship.

#### Miscellen.

15. p. 637. W. Schmid, AMATA. Cf. p. 317. The sense is *ipsissimus*.

16. pp. 637-8. J. Baunack, ἐνέωρα "in die Höhe". Emends an inscription in Arch. Anzeig. Bd. XXI (1906), p. 24.

17. p. 638. E. F. Krause, Zu Horaz Sat. I. 8, 39 emends Iulius to Vilius.

18. pp. 638-9. A. Becker, Eine Virgilreminiszenz in Wielands Oberon.

19. pp. 639-640. O. Crusius, Vergilius und Kleio. On the spelling in German of the name of the muse.  
Indices.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXXIV (1905).

Janvier.

Gédéon Huet. La Version néerlandaise des Lorrains: Nouvelles études. 23 pages. This interesting article is divided into the following sections: I. Date du poème néerlandais; II. Le poème néerlandais est-il original ou traduit du Français? III. Données nouvelles sur le contenu de la branche néerlandaise; IV. Notes supplémentaires: *a.* Récits légendaires sur Hasting; *b.* Sur un épisode des Lorrains néerlandais.

P. Meyer. Notice du ms. 9225 de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique (Legendier français). 20 pages. This article is one of a series describing manuscripts which contain collections of Old French lives of saints and similar legends. The present collection is compared with other similar collections, and a detailed description of its contents is given.

D. de Bartholomæis. De Rambaut e de Coine. 11 pages. This poem is a *jeu-parti* dealing with a question of love. It is published in a critical edition with a full commentary.

A. Thomas. Le Roman de Goufier de Lastours. 11 pages. This is a Latin prose text published from two Paris manuscripts.

John Taggart Clark. L'Influence de l'accent sur les consonnes médiales en Italien. 21 pages. The theory propounded by Meyer-Lübke is here opposed at considerable length. This article is an extract from a Harvard thesis written under the guidance of Prof. Charles H. Grandgent.

Mélanges. P. Meyer, De quelques manuscrits français conservés dans les bibliothèques des États-Unis. P. Meyer, La chanson des Clowecons. P. Meyer, L'inscription en vers de l'épée de Gauvain. Jessie L. Weston, Wauchier de Denain and Bleheris (Bledhericus). A. Thomas, Pour un "Dictié de la Vierge Marie": Fait divers parisien (1401). A. Thomas, Anc. franç. loirre, loitre. A. Thomas, Anc. franç. rousseruel, roseruel. A. Thomas, Anc. franç. rovent. J. Désormaux, Savoyard viorba, viorbe.

**Comptes rendus.** Gaston Paris, *Sur l'Appendix Probi*. III (M. Roques). Lucy Allen Paton, *Studies in the Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance* (A. Jeanroy). Nicola Zingarelli, *Dante* (Paget Toynbee). Ernst Hoepffner, *Eustache Deschamps: Leben und Werke* (G. Raynaud). W. Heymann, *Französische Dialektwörter bei Lexikographen des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts* (A. Thomas). Eugène Lintilhac, *Histoire générale du théâtre en France: I. Le théâtre sérieux du moyen âge* (A. Thomas). A. Tobler, *Etymologisches* (A. Thomas). Paul Sébillot, *Le Folklore en France: I. Le Ciel et la Terre* (P. Meyer).

**Périodiques.** *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXVIII. 5 (M. Roques, with discussion of etymologies). *Romanische Forschungen*, XIV (M. Roques). *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, I-XVIII (P. Meyer). *Revue de philologie française et de littérature*, XVII-XVIII (P. Meyer). *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, I (P. Meyer).

**Chronique.** Obituary notice of Baron d'Avril. Burning of the Turin library. Simplification of French orthography.

**Livres annoncés sommairement.** 30 titles. *L'origine et le parler des Canadiens français*, Québec, 1903. *Le roman de la Violette: a Study of the Manuscripts and the Original Dialect*, by Douglas Labaree Buffum. *A Contribution to the Study of the French Element in English*, by Jules Derocquigny.

#### Avril.

A. Thomas. *Gloses provençales inédites tirées d'un ms. des Derivationes d'Ugucio de Pise* (Paris, Bibl. Nat., lat. 7622). 29 pages. These glosses were made in the Latin manuscript by various Provençal readers in explanation of difficult Latin words in the text.

G. Huet. *Sur quelques formes de la légende du Chevalier au Cygne*. 9 pages. This article is divided into the following sections: I. *Le récit du Dolopathos: son origine*; II. *Sur certaines versions du groupe "Beatrix"*.

P. Meyer. *Notice du ms. 305 de Queen's College, Oxford (Légendier français)*. 22 pages. This French manuscript of the fifteenth century is the most bulky of all the French collections of lives of the saints that have come down to us from the Middle Ages. It is here compared with the somewhat similar manuscript at Paris, Bibl. Nat., fr. 987, although the latter is a much smaller work.

Raymond Weeks. *Études sur Aliscans (suite)*. 41 pages. This instalment of the article contains: V. *Foucon de Candie*; VI. *La chanson de Willame*; VII. *Témoignage des autres chansons de geste au sujet de l'emplacement de la bataille*; VIII. *Témoignage des chroniques*; IX. *Les étapes de la légende*.



Mélanges. P. Meyer, L'inscription en vers de l'épée de Gauvain. Gaston Raynaud, Une nouvelle version du fabliau de La Nonnette. A. Thomas, Ponthus de la Tour-Landri. A. Thomas, Normand caieu "moule". A. Thomas, Français milouin. A. Thomas, Prov. colonhet et colonhier "fusain". Albert Dauzat, Provençal bodosca, bedosca. C. Nigra, \*Trekawda (Haute-Savoie), trekawdé, trakudé (Aoste), etc.

Corrections. A. Mussafia, *Per il Tristano di Beroul*, ed. Muret.

Comptes rendus. Mélanges de philologie offerts à Ferdinand Brunot (A. Thomas). G. Durville, Catalogue de la bibliothèque du Musée Thomas Dobrée, Tome I<sup>er</sup> Manuscrits (P. Meyer).

Dr. Robert Kaltenbacher, *Der altfranzösische Roman "Paris et Vienne"* (P. Meyer). L.-H. Labande, Antoine de La Salle, nouveaux documents sur sa vie et ses relations avec la maison d'Anjou; Werner Söderhjelm, Notes sur Antoine de La Sale et ses œuvres (Gaston Raynaud). J. Trenel, L'Ancien Testament et la langue française du moyen âge (E. Bourciez). Franz Settegast, Quellenstudien zur galloromanischen Epik. Edward Porębowicz, Études sur l'histoire de la littérature du moyen âge (J. H. Reinhold). Dr. Leo Wiese, *Die Lieder des Blondel de Nesle*, kritische Ausgabe nach allen Handschriften (A. Jeanroy). C. H. Grandgent, *An Outline of the Phonology and Morphology of Old Provençal* (A. Thomas).

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXVIII. 6 (M. Roques, with discussion of etymologies). Romanische Forschungen, XV (M. Roques). Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris, IX-XII (A. Thomas). Bulletin de la Société liégeoise de littérature wallonne, XLII.

Chronique. Obituary notices of Giusto Grion and Marcel Schwob. M. Henri Marcel has succeeded M. Léopold Delisle as Administrateur de la Bibliothèque Nationale.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 8 titles. Ch. H. Haskins, *The University of Paris in the Sermons of the Thirteenth Century*. Stanley Leman Galpin, "Cortois and Vilain": A Study of the Distinctions made between them by the French and Provençal Poets of the Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. Juillet.

A. Thomas. *Le Nominatif pluriel asymétrique des Substantifs masculins en ancien Provençal*. 11 pages. The grammatical peculiarity here treated of is in strong contrast to Old French usage.

H. Omont. *Notice sur quelques Feuilletts retrouvés d'un manuscrit français de la Bibliothèque de Dijon*. 11 pages. Thirty-seven leaves were cut out of this manuscript many years ago, and twelve of them have recently been discovered in various

places. What has become of the remaining twenty-five leaves is unknown.

Arthur Piaget. *La Belle Dame sans Merci et ses Imitations*: VIII. *Le Jugement du povre triste amant banny*; IX. *Les Erreurs du jugement de l'amant banny*; X. *L'Amant rendu cordelier à l'observance d'amours*. 54 pages. The first of these poems is preserved in four manuscripts, the second in one manuscript, and the third is already well known to the scholarly world.

Paul Meyer. *Fragments de Manuscrits français*: I. *Fragment de Garin le Lorrain*; II. *Fragments de Girbert de Metz*; III. *Fragments de Girart de Vienne*; IV. *Fragment de la branche XI de Renart*. 29 pages. Fragments of Old-French texts such as these are frequently of great importance in determining the history of the text.

*Mélanges*. J. Derocquigny, *Anc. franç. besuchier*. A. Thomas, *Franch. élanguer, élangueur*. A. Thomas, *Franch. dialectal fenecrotet*. A. Thomas, *Franch. rancune*. A. Thomas, *Anc. franç. renformer*; *franch. mod. renformir*.

*Comptes rendus*. Prof. Dr. Carl Wahlund, *Die altfranzösische Prosaübersetzung von Brendans Meerfahrt* (P. Meyer). Émile Roy, *Le Mystère de la Passion en France du XIV<sup>e</sup> au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Marius Sepet). Ivor B. John, *Notes on Celtic Studies* (J. Bédier). Ugo Levi, *I monumenti del dialetto di Lido Mazor* (A. Mussafia). Jean Passy, *L'origine des Ossalois* (A. Thomas).

*Périodiques*. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXIX, 1-2 (M. Roques). *Revue des langues romanes*, XLVI-XLVII (P. Meyer). *Bulletin de la société des anciens textes français*, 1904.

*Chronique*. Long obituary notice of Adolf Mussafia by P. Meyer. Literary notes.

*Livres annoncés sommairement*. 12 titles. *Littérature espagnole*, par J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, traduction de Henry D. Davray. *Die Auffassung der Jungfrau Maria in der altfranzösischen Literatur*, von H. Becker. *Canzonette musicali francesi e spagnuole alla corte d'Este*, per G. Bertoni.

Septembre.

A. Jeanroy. *Poésies du Troubadour Gavaudan*. 43 pages. This is a critical edition of one of the most obscure of the Provençal lyric poets, whose works comprise ten short poems.

A. Thomas. *Nouveaux documents inédits pour servir à la biographie de Pierre de Nesson*. 19 pages. The legal documents here published are all dated after the poet's death, and hence were overlooked by the editor when publishing a previous article on the same subject.

A. Piaget. *La Belle Dame sans merci et ses imitations*: XI. *L'hôpital d'amour par Achille Caulier*; XII. *Le traité de Ré-*

veille qui dort; XIII. Le débat sans conclusion; XIV. Le des—  
conseillé d'amours, par Henri Anctil; XV. Le loyal amant  
refusé; XVI. La desserte du desloyal; XVII. La sépulture  
d'amour; XVIII. Le martyr d'amour par Franci; XIX. Le dé—  
bat de la dame et de l'écuyer; XX. Poèmes divers; XXI. Con—  
clusion; Appendice. 44 pages.

A. Delboulle. Mots obscurs et rares de l'ancienne langue  
française (suite). 15 pages. With appended footnotes by various  
scholars. Other remarks on words in this series are promised  
in a later article.

Comptes rendus. Renward Brandstetter, Rätoromanische  
Forschungen. I (Jakob Jud). J. Gilliéron et J. Mongin, Étude  
de géographie linguistique: "Scier" dans la Gaule romane du  
Sud et de l'Est (Albert Dauzat).

Périodiques. Revue de Bretagne, II (Gaston Raynaud).  
Piccolo archivio storico dell' antico marchesato di Saluzzo, I-II  
(P. Meyer). Bulletin historique et philologique, 1900-1904  
(P. Meyer).

Chronique. Obituary notice of Jules Gauthier. Literary  
notes.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 10 titles. A Comparative  
Study of the Aesopic Fable in Nicole Bozon, by Ph. Warner  
Harry. Some Examples of French by Englishmen in Old  
French Literature, by Jno. E. Matzke. Une source française  
des poèmes de Gower, par Mlle. R. Elfreda Fowler.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

### BRIEF MENTION.

The advance of conventionality, of regularity, is an old complaint. It is found everywhere in literature, everywhere in art. The decline of picturesqueness in the Paris of 1831 is the burden of Victor Hugo's *Notre Dame*. The day was coming, he said, when Paris from a bird's-eye-view would present a vision of 'ce je ne sais quoi de grandiose dans le simple et d'inattendu dans le beau, qui caractérise un damier'. And that was long before the invasion of the Osmanlis, as the Parisians of my youth called the minions of Haussmann. A few months ago a writer, who seemed to know Spain well, declared that the kerchief and jacket and sash that one looks for as the appropriate costume of the Spanish landlord of the interior, had given way to the London-made suit, and he was cruel enough to go into details and add verisimilitude to his statement by specifying a well-known tailor of Sackville Street, and the price £8. I myself have joined in the chorus and said that 'In the movement of modern life <the unworldly type of professor> is becoming less common even in Germany, once the habitat of intellectual oddities and unpractical dreamers. For this change the Empire may possibly be responsible, but certain it is that such a figure as Freytag's Professor Raschke in the "Verlorene Handschrift" will soon be as extinct as the dodo' (Essays and Studies, p. 128). But these words were written under the first impression of a visit to Germany (1880) after an interval of twenty years. Residence might have corrected the impression, and every now and then returning students tell stories about their German professors that make me less forlorn. But will there ever be another Franz Ritter with his strange pathetic utterance, his peculiar pronunciation, his queer way of getting his tongue twisted, his 'Manso's Vermisste Sriften', and his 'gelungener Lohndiener' instead of 'gedungener Tagelöhner'? A volume might be written about Ernst von Leutsch, who was not only a source of innocent merriment to others, but a well-spring of joy to himself, for which he seems to have got little credit. The Preface to his 'Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die griechische Metrik' is highly characteristic of the man, and one shares his delight over the 'Klippen und scharfe Ecken' he had prepared for the 'fingerfertige Nichtkenner', who should undertake to get up a book out of his material. After Krüger passed away, the well-meaning Pökel ploughed up a lot of the torpedoes that were hidden in the old Krüger grammars and corrected texts which Krüger had distorted, or detorted, in order to blow up the smaller sex or hoist

unwary copyists. All dustmen are not as dry as the dust in which they deal. There are quotable bits in Lobeck and pawky parentheses in Veitch. The satire may be petrified satire, and the fun, cryptic fun, but who will begrudge the poor carver of gurgoyles the little joke that only the benevolent sky will see? It is a pleasure to put the diaphragm of a comma between two learned references. Remove the diaphragm and something like a mild explosion of merriment will ensue. But who removes diaphragms, who verifies references? In the long quest of passages that will not only illustrate, but also prove the points that are made, the weary way is often lighted up by the will o' the wisps of fun and fancy. Fix them and the jest is lost. There is a certain satisfaction in citing passages to prove one thing that have been steadily used to prove just the opposite. There is a certain satisfaction in citing an example that seems to contradict, and yet does not contradict the principle laid down. And yet there is danger in this, danger to one's reputation, as if that mattered. I have pointed the finger of scorn more than once at the sentimentalists who have attributed to Aristophanes a line which Aristophanes borrowed from Pindar (Eq. 1329), and I have been waiting for some critics to point out that Ar. Ran. 1152 (S. C. G. § 141) is a quotation from Aischylos, as if quotation and parody conveyed no lesson in syntax.

---

This is a portentously long introduction to an apology that I desire to make to the Manes of Professor Paley, assuredly a portentously long introduction for me because I am always ready to make amends without further ado. And yet a word more is necessary. In my S. C. G. § 193 I cite Eur. Phoen. 81: *ἔριν λύουσα*, as an illustration of the conative present participle. Why this passage above all others? Because Dindorf follows Valckenaer in reading *λύουσα* against the MSS and in foisting an un-Greek construction on Euripides. Nauck cites Valckenaer's 'emendation'. Later editors justly scorn to mention it but as long ago as 1859, Paley scented a solecism, as his commentary shows, though, to be sure, he had not the right vision of the phenomenon. Another illegitimate, though not so utterly illegitimate, future participle has crept into some texts of Euripides through a conjecture of Markland's, who wrote for the MS *θανούσαν* Eur. I. A. 1516 *θανούσαν*. Dindorf has adopted Markland's conjecture, and this is one of the points at which Mr. C. E. S. Headlam in his edition of 1889 forsakes the text of Kirchhoff, being as unappreciative of the character of the future participle as Dr. WALTER HEADLAM has since shewn himself to be (A. J. P. XXVIII 111). Now this limitation of the future participle is a very simple matter and very easily explained, on the theory that the future is originally modal, and that the future participle



is originally modal. The future infinitive may have been modal or it may have come in like the future optative to fill up the scheme of *oratio obliqua*, but the fut. participle is distinctly modal in Homer and is found only in the company of verbs of motion as Monro has duly emphasized (H. G. § 244). The future participle is never simply predictive except in *ὥς* with the future participle, the latest form of *oratio obliqua*, and after verbs of intellectual perception, which, however, from Homer on prefer the *ὅτι* construction. No conditional sense, no causal sense, no adversative sense, no genitive absolute, or at most with rare exceptions. And yet when the latest much lauded 'Go-cart for good little Grecians' counts up the usages of the participle, no hint is given of the coyness of the future participle as there is no explanation of *ὥς οὐ*.

---

Thirty years ago discussing *ὥς οὐ* with the participle (Just. Mart. Apol. I c. 4, 18), I urged as an argument against the conditional conception not only the neg. *οὐ* but the use of the future participle. I was cautious enough to say that it is not *regularly* used as the protasis of an abridged conditional sentence, and it was well that I was so cautious, for a correspondent sometime afterwards confronted me with Dem. 24, 189: *μὴ περὶ τούτων ὑμῶν οἰσόντων* (= *εἰ μὴ οἴσετε*) *τὴν ψῆφον, τί δεῖ ταῦτα λέγοντα ἐνοχλεῖν με νυνί*; but everybody knows Demosthenes' love of *περιβολή* (A. J. P. IX 142), and this lonely example ought not to count in the face of the steadiness of the language in this regard.<sup>1</sup> A rare anarthrous future participle is found in Ar. Pax 756: *κολάκων οἰμωζομένων*, where Mazon has a note, but Sharpley and Van Leeuwen pass over it dry-shod. By the way, Van Leeuwen's syntactical notes are by no means up to the mark he has attained elsewhere as an interpreter of the mind of Aristophanes.

---

The eighteenth fascicle of the Schanz *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache* (Würzburg, Stuber) deals with

<sup>1</sup> 'It may well be questioned whether another such example can be found in Greek' says Spieker, who after a diligent search in the orators, has found only two other genitives absolute with the fut. part. in the orators unaccompanied by *ὥς* (A. J. P. VI 325). 'It must never be forgotten', says an eminent physicist, 'that theories are only useful so long as they admit of the harmonious correlation of facts into a reasonable system. Directly a fact refuses to be pigeon-holed, and will not be explained on theoretic grounds, the theory must go or it must be revised to admit the new fact'. Now, a severe rule like this is hardly applicable to a thing so freakish as language, so feminine as language, of which we may say as Renan says of religions, '<Elles> sont des femmes dont il est très facile de tout obtenir, si on sait les prendre, impossible de rien obtenir, si on veut procéder de haute lutte'. An artist in language may make language do anything by coaxing. But there are those who do brutal violence to language and there is no Lynch-law to sweep the offenders and the offence out of the world of literature.

*Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles I Die Poesie*, and the author, MARTIN P. NILSSON, begins with a justification of the method pursued in these studies, a justification that is by no means superfluous. During the slow evolution of the *Beiträge* the syntactical basis has shifted a good deal. The whole elaborate structure is slipping into 'the deep channel of woe' βαθὺν ὄχρον *āras* men call psychology, and the conjunctions, which used to serve as the markers of research, have been ruthlessly plucked up by students of linguistics like Professor Morris, whose advent on the syntactical field seems to have frightened so many of the old-fashioned investigators out of their propriety. In his *Principles and Methods* (p. 26), Professor Morris cites with approval from Probst the doctrine that the conjunction or particle acquires its meaning from the sentence, not the sentence from the conjunction, and NILSSON gives Morris the credit for this bold statement, which loses much of its boldness when one reflects that we call the same conjunction temporal, conditional, causal or adversative, according to the quicksand of the context, and that so thoughtful a grammarian as Lange found himself reduced to defining *ei* as an 'adhibitive' particle, a definition that would answer for any particle under the sun.

---

As my own investigations have dealt chiefly with the manners and customs, the social behavior of the language, have dealt with the Herakleitean *ὥς* rather than the Parmenidean *ὅτι* or else with the sophistic juggling of *ὥς* and *ὅτι*, my results, if I dare speak of results, have not been affected by recent developments, and I welcome every new theory in explanation of the phenomena as I do every new aspect of the Homeric Question. My life has not been long enough to answer a tithe of the questions I have asked myself as to the range and sphere of usage. The establishment of a catena is a laborious task, the problem of the missing link is often one that taxes the syntactical imagination, and the evaluation of the facts for stylistic purposes calls on all the resources of the 'Feinfühligkeit philologischen Nachempfindens', to use a happy phrase of the lamented Usener. Of course everybody is a psychologist nowadays. Indeed I myself have been accused of being a psychologist *malgré moi*, doubtless to the infinite amusement of the real psychologists, to whom I have opened wide the portals of the Journal. This being the state of things, it is not surprising that NILSSON finds it necessary to defend himself and the *Beiträge* generally by an introduction on the influence of logical needs on language, the introduction itself being introduced by a *captatio benevolentiae* addressed to the psychologists, to whom the great advance in the modern science of language is attributed.

---

The grammatical type, says NILSSON, has a psychological basis but logic intrudes; logic narrows the range of each type

and enriches its content. This is most clearly the case in literary language especially in prose, so largely subject to logical processes. Psychologically an absolute parataxis is very rare. The logical tendency is to subordinate one sentence to another. Hence the tendency to fix the relation by grammatical subordination. And as an instructive example of the victory of grammatical subordination NILSSON cites the much discussed *δέ ἀποδοτικόν* in which psychological parataxis holds its own against grammatical hypotaxis. As soon as the grammatical type establishes itself firmly, *δέ* is felt as a coordinating conjunction, and disappears from the apodosis. This *δέ ἀποδοτικόν* does not stand alone and NILSSON emphasizes the *τε—καί* use, the so-called *cum inversum* use in temporal sentences as Xen. An. 2, 1, 7: *ἤδη τε ἦν περὶ πλήθουσιν ἀγορὰν καὶ ἔρχονται κήρυκες*. This is a favorite construction in naïve or would-be naïve narrative, and the tone is worth noting, but from my point of view, wherever we have correlation we have a manner of subordination, so that there is no use of discussing the fusion of parataxis and hypotaxis in sentences like these (A. J. P. XXIII 254).

---

The causal sentence is one of the most difficult subjects in the whole range of syntax, and I am not to be betrayed into a discussion of it in the narrow precincts of *Brief Mention* with the whistle of my steamer in my ear. The English language is a living monument of the slowness of the popular mind to clarify its conception of the causal nexus, and we have been fain to borrow our chief causal particle from the French. The inner object *that* (*ὅτι*), which is the native form, is still dominant with verbs of emotion but does not satisfy the causal feeling and *for that* is also unsatisfactory. The temporal sentence has a causal connotation but the nice distinction, once set up between 'sith' and 'since', does not hold. In Greek, as is well known, *ἐπεὶ* which corresponds to 'since', is the leading causal particle and it is to *ἐπεὶ* chiefly that NILSSON's paper is devoted, but I fail to see that he has made any use of Zycha's elaborate article on *ἐπεὶ* and the *ἐπεὶ* group in the Wiener Studien VII 82-115; and in his discussion of other temporal particles, used in a causal nexus, such as *ὅτε* and *ὁπότε*, NILSSON stops short of the generalization that all temporal particles with present and perfect indicative have, as a rule, a causal connotation, and among them particles of temporal limit, a point, which, like so many others, was hidden from the eyes of NILSSON's associate, Fuchs (S. C. G. § 366; A. J. P. IV 416; XXIV 389, 394, 400, 405; XXV 230). But the second part of NILSSON's treatise will give me an opportunity to discuss the whole subject more fully.

---

'Syntax and no end!' I hear the unsyntactical reader of *Brief Mention* say: 'No matter how a paragraph begins, it is sure to

bring up against a syntactical nostrum, very much like the advertisements of quack medicines that are inserted in the reading columns of a newspaper for the fooling of the unwary'. Now I am a sympathetic soul and, as Charles Lamb hissed his own farce of 'Mr. H.' in unison with the pit, so I am often at one with my critics and not unfrequently become so tired of other people's syntactical disquisitions that I am fain to renounce my own. But when Mr. CORNFORD speaks of his *Thucydides Mythistoricus* as an attempt to understand, not the syntax, but the mind, of Thucydides the syntactician in me revolts against this attitude of superiority. He who does not know the syntax of Thucydides does not know the mind of Thucydides. Syntax has been called the 'Parademarsch' of language, and we are all in the procession. He who sneers at the study of Thucydidean syntax fails to do justice to the conditions of Thucydidean thought. It might not be going too far to say that the two foci of the elliptical orbit of the great historian are points that fall within the range of syntactical study, the conception of causality and the domination of the abstract noun (A. J. P. XXIII 17). A well-known Homerist has written a noteworthy essay on 'Eine Schwäche der homerischen Denkart', and Mr. CORNFORD's book is an impugment of 'Eine Schwäche der thukydideischen Denkart'. The great historian, it seems, had not the same insight into the causes of the Peloponnesian war, as is possessed by Mr. CORNFORD, for the historian of to-day is largely concerned with economic causes. Corinth reaches forth, Athens reaches forth, both reach forth westward, the only open quarter. Conflicting interests bring about the struggle. There is nothing startlingly new about this. More than ten years ago in a study of the Peloponnesian War from the point of view of an old Confederate, I did not fail to draw the business parallel between the two conflicts (Atlantic Monthly, May, 1897), and the Peloponnesian line was represented thus:

'The famous Megarian decree of Perikles, which closed the market of Athens to Megarians gave rise to angry controversy, and the refusal to rescind that decree led to open war. But Megara was little more than a pretext. The subtle influence of Corinth was potent. The great merchant city of Greece dreaded the rise of Athens to dominant commercial importance and in the conflict between the Corinthian brass and the Attic clay the clay was shattered. Corinth does not show her hand much in the Peloponnesian war. She figures at the beginning and then disappears. But the old mole is at work the whole time, and what the Peloponnesians called the Attic war and the Attics the Peloponnesian war might have been called the Corinthian war.'

But economic causes do not explain everything. The final cause is the primal conception of causes. It is, if you choose, a 'Schwäche der menschlichen Denkart'. We cannot escape the emotional element, the personal element. The study of the Greek causal sentence which I have just put aside is an indispensable introduction to the study of the historian of the Peloponnesian war. Economic causes resolve themselves into *πλεονεξία* and *πλεονεξία* becomes an *αίτία* and the famous Thucydidean *πρόφασις* is a surface



*aiṛía*, but not merely a surface *aiṛía*. There is a *μῆνις* in every struggle. The *aiṛía* incorporates itself. To call it a policy does not clear up matters. Those who have lived *αἰσθανόμενοι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ* through a great war may be presumed to know more about such matters than cloistered speculators and can do justice to Homer with his Wrath of Achilles, to Herodotos with his Eternal Feminine, and to Thukydides with his Everlasting Abstract. For it is the abstract noun—not Perikles—that 'lightens and thunders and makes a stir-about' of Greek history—that semi-personification, in which the half is more potent than the whole, that abstract noun, which plays havoc with the critic as well as with him criticized (A. J. P. XVIII 368).

---

W. P. M: Students of Theocritus and Virgil will be interested in an excellent book by Mr. WALTER W. GREG, 'Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama', xii+464 pp., London, 1906. The real subject of the work is the pastoral drama in Elizabethan literature, but a good deal of space is devoted to a preliminary account of European pastoralism in general. This preliminary account is probably the best critical study of the subject in English—a remark which one would like to emphasize in a brief notice which aims only at suggesting a few corrections and additions. The surprising statement occurs twice (pp. 5 and 13) that we owe the conception of the Golden Age to the Roman poets of the Augustan period. The conception is at least as old as Hesiod. It is misleading to say (p. 39) that Boccaccio's *Ameto* "set a fashion in literature, namely the intermingling for purposes of narration of prose and verse". Boccaccio may have consciously imitated the *De Consolatione Philosophiae* of Boethius, and the fashion itself was as old as the *Satira Menippea*. The statement (p. 62) that Marot's greatest influence on Spenser is to be found in the November eclogue of the *Shepheardes Calender* might be modified after a careful comparison of the December eclogue with Marot's *Éclogue au Roi*. It is unnecessary (p. 80) to allow Alexander Barclay any special credit for originality in his fifth eclogue. This is based on Mantuan's sixth eclogue (with a passage borrowed from Mantuan's seventh), and follows its Latin model quite as closely as any of the others.

Perhaps the weakest page in the volume is the one which is devoted to Calpurnius and Nemesianus. The seventh poem of Calpurnius can hardly be said to "contrast the life of the town with that of the country". Even if it could, it is not worth saying that Calpurnius appears to have been the first to treat the direct comparison of the two. There is a direct comparison of the two toward the close of Virgil's second *Georgic*. We are told, also, that it is not easy to trace any direct influence of these later bucolic poets. But at least one passage of Calpurnius (vi 32-45) is imitated in Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, *prosa iv*. This is the proposal



to stake a pet stag on the result of a singing match. The animal may be identified by its collar, an ornament which it retains even when it passes on from the page of Sannazaro to Ronsard's first eclogue. Thus, Calpurnius has

ubi pendulus apri  
Dens sedet et nivea distinguit pectora luna;

Sannazaro adds another detail: "e quel monile, che hora gli vedi di marine conchiglie, con quel dente di Cinghiale, che à guisa d'una bianca Luna dinanzi al petto gli pende"; and the augmented description is faithfully reproduced in Ronsard:

D' un carquan enrichy de coquilles de mer,  
D' ou pend la croche dent d' un sanglier, qui ressemble  
En rondeur le croissant qui se rejoint ensemble.

A poem by Hieronymus Fracastorius, 'Alcon, sive de cura canum venaticorum', is clearly modeled upon Calpurnius, Bucol. V. One gets a different impression of the influence of Calpurnius and Nemesianus from Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la Novela*, i 415: 'los imitaron en gran manera todos los bucólicos italianos y españoles del siglo xvi, comenzando por Sannazaro y acabando por Valbuena y Barahona de Soto.'

---

G. L. H.: Attention has been called to Professor C. H. Grandgent's admirable manual of *Provençal Phonology and Morphology* (A. J. Ph. XXVI, 364). His *Introduction to Vulgar Latin* (pp. XVIII, 220, D. C. Heath & Co., 1907), which appeals to a wider circle of scholars, can be equally commended. Mr. Grandgent's book is the first attempt to present as a whole a subject, of which the material is widely scattered, and the problems manifold. Certain phases of the subject have been exhaustively treated, and the results of these investigations are presented in a succinct form in their due places; and Mr. Grandgent is as careful to cite his authorities, as he is cautious in accepting their theses. Written especially for Romance students, the practice of noting the survival of Latin forms and constructions in the various Romance languages is another valuable feature of the book, and a detailed Table of Contents, and an Index of thirty pages, facilitates the use of the book for purposes of reference.

---

D. M. R.: The need which archaeologists have long felt for a complete history of the study of Greek inscriptions has been supplied by CHABERT, *Histoire sommaire des études d'épigraphie grecque* (Paris, Leroux, 1906), a reprint of a series of articles which have already appeared in the *Revue Archéologique*. The introduction discusses the peculiarities of Greek epigraphy, showing especially the superiority of stone originals over copied

manuscripts. Chapter I gives a survey of the oldest collections which preceded any idea of a *Corpus*, taking up first the ancient authors, Philochorus, Craterus, Polemo, Alcetas, Aristodemus, Neoptolemus, etc. After these men for over 1500 years there was silence and ignorance until Cyriac of Ancona (1391-1457) became the Schliemann of Greek epigraphy, and was followed by many others. Chapter II deals with the attempts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to form a collection of all Greek inscriptions; Chapter III with the *Corpus* of Boeckh, the Expédition de Morée, the work of Le Bas, Ross, Franz, etc. Chapter IV treats of the permanent archaeological institutions in Athens. In Chapters V and VI will be found in convenient form the new arrangement and numbering of the new *Corpus* (*Inscriptiones Graecae*) proposed by Wilamowitz in June, 1903, and since adopted by most scholars. Chapter VII (wrongly numbered VI), with the title *L'état des choses*, is devoted to publications and manuals, to excavations and explorations, and to the future of epigraphical studies. The hope is expressed that the *I. G.* may soon be completed, but with the loss of Von Prott, Benndorf, and Dittenberger, this can hardly be expected.

It is a pleasure to see how thoroughly acquainted Chabert is with the entire field of Greek epigraphy, and how impartial his treatment is. To be sure he speaks (p. 51) of the *pillages brutaux* of Lord Elgin, but Wilhelm, Sterrett and others are mentioned with the highest esteem. Chabert's knowledge of things American, however, is somewhat deficient. The first director of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens was not Prof. Waldstein (pp. 146-7), but Prof. Goodwin. Chabert has evidently not seen Prof. Seymour's Bulletin on the First Twenty Years of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, as he has the work of Radet on the French School, and that of Michaelis on the German School. Otherwise something would have been said about the American excavations at the Argive Heraeum, Eretria, Corinth, etc.

---

D. M. R.: A dramatic and popular account is given by TUCKER in his *Life in Ancient Athens* (Macmillan, 1906) of social and public life in Athens in the period of her greatest glory. There are chapters on Athens and its Environment; Public Buildings, Streets, etc.; Citizens, Outlanders, Slaves, Women; House and Furniture; The Social Day of a Typical Citizen; Woman's Life and Fashions; Boyhood,—Education and Training; Army and Navy; Religion; Festivals and the Theatre; Council and Assembly; An Athenian Trial; Burial; Athenian Art; Modernness of the Athenian. The eighty-five illustrations are from secondary sources, many from the plates used by Macmillan for Hill's Illustrations of School Classics. The book is of value to the general

reader, but disappointing to the student of Greek life and literature, because of its inaccuracies and meagre knowledge of Greek antiquities, and owing to the fact that Professor TUCKER has not acquainted himself with the standard works of Bauer, Blümner, Dörpfeld, Droysen, Giraud, and Fougères. Since Professor TUCKER aims to leave a true and sound impression of the period to which he limits himself (440 to 330 B. C.), a view (p. 33) of the Athenian acropolis as it appeared in the second century A. D. is out of place. In the fifth century the ascent to the acropolis was a winding path and not the marble flight of stairs as is stated p. 31 (cf. the restoration in Fougères Athènes, p. 34). A plan of a Delian house of the second century B. C. (p. 93) gives a wrong notion of a classical Greek house which had no peristyle. Due study of the latest research and of the houses of the fourth and third centuries B. C. excavated at Priene, the Greek Pompeii, would have furnished better examples and would have convinced Prof. Tucker that Greek houses were not built around more than one court (cf. pp. 91, 97). There is no evidence that "the Parthenon was apparently lighted by openings in the roof" (p. 37). A Greek temple was verily the house of God and not a meeting-place of a congregation, and received sufficient light through the large door, the light in Greece being very strong. Windows were rare, and only used where there were paintings, as in the Propylaea and Erechtheum. P. 48, the passage quoted is not from Dicaearchus, but probably from Heracleides of the second century B. C. P. 195, the statement about a leather garment worn from the waist and a corselet in two halves fails to recognise the difference between the metal corselet in two parts and the leather corselet with flaps at the bottom, consisting of one piece, the ends of which are brought together in front. In Chapter XII (pp. 227, 229, 232) Haigh's reasonless compromise between a high stage and no stage is adopted, but even in a popular handbook Dörpfeld should no longer be ignored. The Athenian theatre held not more than 17,000 spectators, certainly not 30,000 (p. 227). High-soled boots were probably not used by actors of the fifth and fourth centuries, as is stated, p. 235 (cf. Harvard Studies XVI, p. 123 f.). In Chapter XVI the Hermes of Praxiteles, busts of Pericles and Plato, and the Laocoon group (sic) are chosen to illustrate Athenian Art from 440 to 330 B. C. P. 290, the Attic-Ionic style of architecture is used to illustrate the Ionic.

---

D. M. R.: An excellent selection of 230 Greek inscriptions, taken mostly from Dittenberger, and dating from the seventh century B. C. to Roman imperial times, has been made by JANELL, *Ausgewählte Inschriften* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1906). The introduction deals with the use, material, content, form, language, alphabet, numerical signs, dialect, place of erection of inscriptions

and with epigraphical collections. No reference is made, however, to Cagnat, Reinach, Roberts, Hill's revised edition of Hicks' Historical Inscriptions or to the *Tituli Asiae Minoris* and Dr. JANELL (p. 5) does not know that the inscriptions of Delos (I. G. XI), as well as those of Delphi (I. G. VIII), will be published by the French. The first part contains documents from the public life of the Greeks arranged in chronological order and according to subject matter (dedications, oaths, decrees, treaties, letters, chronica, edicts, etc.) The second part, arranged according to material only, embraces notices from religious life (dedications, temple inventories, lists of priests; inscriptions concerning sacrifices, manumission and punishment of slaves, religious organizations, oracles, cures, curses; and grave-inscriptions). The omission of all signs for restorations and lacunae and changes from the text of the stones, and failure to keep the original spelling, will not conduce to accurate and scientific knowledge, which should be the aim even of a book meant for high-schools and laymen. A charming text binds together the inscriptions which are paralleled by German translations. Many modern terms, often not equivalents of the Greek, are used; cf. p. 29, der oberste Priester for στεφανηφόρος, p. 33 das Amt eines Konsuls for προξενία, p. 39 Dukaten for χρυσοὺς, p. 67 Kammerherr for τῶν πρώτων φίλων, Jugendgespiele for σύντροφον, Oberscharfrichter for ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐγχειριδίου, pp. 107, 108 Chaiselongue for χαμεῦνα παράκολλος, Schlafrock for ἱμάτιον, p. 118 ungläubiger Thomas for ἄπιστος, p. 127 Herzog for ἀρχηγέτας. The verse-translations of the grave-inscriptions are fairly good, but the other translations are frequently inaccurate. The worst example is perhaps, p. 73, where εἰδισαν τὴν παρ' ὑμῖν ἐξετασίαν τῶν δούλων οἱ φεύγοντες τὴν δίκην is rendered *die in den Prozess verwickelten Sklaven*, although the subject of εἰδισαν is Eubouleus and Tryphera who are not slaves. There are also many inaccurate statements. To cite only one or two cases, p. 7 Παρθένον (who is Athena) is called Iphigenia. P. 12, "die Datierung auf den Monat wird durch die Prytanie gegeben". P. 93, the important epithet Τιάμον is omitted after Μηνί, and p. 145 Janell says it has not yet been explained, but cf. Harvard Studies VI, 68 f. P. 97 the idea is given that no. 125 (I. G. I, Suppl., p. 78, 334 a) is quoted by Herodotus V, 77. The inscription quoted by Herodotus will be found in I. G. I, p. 178, and Lolling, Κατάλογος τοῦ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐπιγραφικοῦ Μουσείου, p. 66, no. 95. It is *stoichedon* and the order of the couplets is the reverse of that in no. 125, which is the original inscription to be found also in the *Anthologia Lyrica*<sup>4</sup>, p. 266, no. (188). P. 117, note 3 JANELL places the scene of Aristophanes' *Plutus* in the Peiraeus. It is more probably in the Asclepieum which has been excavated on the southern slope of the Athenian acropolis. Most of the many misprints correct themselves, but Soundso (p. 19 for So und so) is a peculiar name for a *proxenos* and benefactor of Athens.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 11 E. 17th St., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Bennett (C. E.) The Latin language; a historical outline of its sounds, inflections, and syntax. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1907. 14+258 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.

Caesar's Gallic War; with introd., notes by A. T. Walker. Chicago, *Scott, Foresman & Co.*, 1907. 528+93 pp. il. pl. 6 maps (1 double), 12°, cl., \$1.25.

Euripides. The Heraclidae; ed. by A. C. Pearson. New York, *Putnam*, 1907. 40+166+8 pp. 16°, cl., 90 cts.

Frye (P. H.) Corneille; the neo-classic tragedy and the Greek. Lincoln, Neb., *University of Nebraska*, 1907. 219-249 pp. 8°, pap., \$1.

Hale (W. G.) A first Latin Book. Chicago, *Atkinson, Mentzer & Grover*, 1907. 16+354 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.

Homer's Iliad; first three books and selections, by J. R. Sitlington Sterrett. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1907. 8+179+270+161 pp. il. map. 8°, cl., \$1.60.

Homer. The Iliad; rendered into English blank verse by the Earl of Derby. New York, *Dutton*, 1907. 7+424 pp. 12°, cl., 40 cts. net; leath. 60 cts. net.

— Tr. by Edgar Alfred Tibbetts. Boston, *Richard G. Badger*, 1907. 557 pp. 12°, cl., \$2.

Hyperides. Hyperidis orationes et fragmenta; recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruit F. G. Kenyon. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1907. 12°, cl., 90 cts.

Inglis (Alex. J.) and Prettyman (Virgil). First Book in Latin. New York, *Macmillan*, 1906, 1907. 12°, cl., 90 cts. net.

Lucretius. Tr., with an analysis of the six books, by H. A. J. Monro. New York, *Dutton*, 1907. 63+239 pp. 12°, cl., 40 cts. net; leath., 60 cts. net.

Mahabharata. The Bhagavad gita; comp. and adapted from numerous old and new translations of the original Sanscrit text by Yogi Ramacharaka. Chicago, *Yogi Publication Society*, 1907. 151 pp. 12°, cl., 75 cts.

Plato. The Apology and Crito; ed. by I. Flagge. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1907. 5+205 pp. por. 12°, cl., \$1.40.

— Platonis opera; recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruit, Joannes Burnet. V. 5, Tetralogiam ix, definitiones et spuria continens. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1907. 12°, cl., \$2.

— The Pocket Plato; ed. from Jowett's translation by S. C. Woodhouse. New York, *Dutton*, 1907. 7+246 pp. 16°, cl., \$1 net.

— The Republic. Bk. 5; tr. by Alexander Kerr. Chicago, *Charles H. Kerr & Co.*, 1907. 34+71 pp. 12°, pap., 15 cts.



Prescott (H. W.) Some phases of the relation of thought to verse in Plautus. Berkeley, Cal., *University of California Press*, 1907. 205+262 pp. 8°, pap., 50 cts.

Sophocles. The Ajax; with a commentary abridged from the larger ed. of Sir R. C. Jebb, by A. C. Pearson. New York, *Putnam*, 1907. 47+208 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.

## ENGLISH.

Annual of British School of Athens. Vol. XI. Sessions 1904-1905. London, 1906. 8°. 21s.

Burrows (R. M.) The Discoveries in Crete and their Bearing on the History of ancient Civilisation. London, 1907. 8°. 260 pp. 5s.

Josa (F. P. L.) Introductory Manual of the Hindi Language. London, 1907. 8°. 4s.

Kroeber (A.) The Yokuts Language of South Central California. London, 1907. 8°. 208 pp. 12s.

Sanjana, Rastamji Edulji Dastoor Peshotan. Zarathushtra and Zarathushtrianism in the Avesta. Calcutta, 1907. 8°. 8 rp.

Smith (E. W.) A Handbook of the Ila Language, commonly called the Seshukulembwe, spoken in North-West Rhodesia, South Central Africa. London, 1907. 8°. 15s.

## FRENCH.

Gollier (Th.) Manuel de la langue japonaise. Bruxelles, 1907. 8°. 25 fr.

Graffin (R.) Patrologia syriaca. T. H. Aphraates, Bardesane, etc., in-8°, *Lib. de Paris*. 30 fr.

Lévi (S.) Mahayana-Sutralamkara (bib. de l'éc. des h. ét., 159), in-8°, *H. Champion*. 15 fr.

Pierret (P.) Le Livre des morts des anciens Égyptiens, trad. avec notes et index, 2<sup>e</sup> éd., in-18, *E. Leroux*. 15 fr.

Scheil (V.) Textes élamites anzanites, 3<sup>e</sup> série (Mém. de la délég. de Perse, t. IX, in-4°, *E. Leroux*. 50 fr.

## SPANISH.

Commelerán y Gomez (F. A.) Diccionario clasico-etimologico latino-español. Madrid, 1907. 4°. xxxi, 1511 pp. 41 pes. 25 cts.

## GERMAN.

Adam (Ludw.) Über die Unsicherheit literarischen Eigentums bei Griechen u. Römern. (220 S.) 8°. Düsseldorf, *Schaub*, 1906. m. 4.

Aischylos, Die Eumeniden. Erklärende Ausg. v. Frdr. Blass. (iii, 179 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1907. m. 5.

Album Terentianum picturas continens ex imagine phototypa Lugdunensi Terentii codd. Ambrosiani H 75 et Parisini 7899 sumptas et lithographice expressas. Praefatus et picturas latine interpretatus est Iac. van Wageningen. (lxxxviii S.) 38,5×27 cm. Groningen, *P. Noordhoff*, 1907. m. 6.

Arriani, Flavii, quae exstant omnia ed. A. G. Ross. Vol. I. Alexandri anabasin continens. Accedit tabula phototypica. (liv, 426 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 3.80.

— Ed. minor. (333 S.) 8°. Leipzig. m. 2.10.

Ausfeld (Adf.) Der griechische Alexanderroman. Nach des Verf. Tode hrsg. v. Wilh. Kroll. (xi, 253 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 8.

Barth (J.) Sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Semitischen. 1. Tl. (iii, 54 S.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*, 1907. m. 3.

Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Hrsg. v. M. Schanz. Lex. 8°. Würzburg, *A. Stuber's Verl.* 18. Heft. Nilsson (Mart. P.) Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles. I. Die Poesie. (v, 145 S.) 1907. m. 5.50.

Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* XIX. Bd. 3. Tl. Prince (J. D.) Materials for a Sumerian lexicon, with a grammatical introduction. Part III. Containing the letters N-Z. (S. 249-366 in Autogr.) 1907. m. 15. XXI. Huber (Pat. Engelb., O. F. M.) Die Personennamen in den Keilschrifturkunden aus der Zeit der Könige v. Ur u. Nisin. (viii, 208 S.) 1907. m. 36.

— vorderasiatische. 8°. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* I. Bd. 1. Abtlg. Thureau-Dangin (F.) Die sumerischen u. akkadischen Königsinschriften. (xx, 275 S.) 1907. m. 10.

— indogermanische. Hrsg. v. Herm. Hirt u. Wilh. Streitberg. 1. Abtlg. Sammlung indogerman. Lehr- und Handbücher. 1. Reihe: Grammatiken. 8°. Heidelberg, *C. Winters Verl.* 4. Bd. Stahl (J. M.) Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit. (xii, 838 S.) 1907. m. 21.

Bischoff (Erich). Babylonisch-Astrales im Weltbilde des Thalmud u. Midrasch. (viii, 172 S. m. Abbildgn.) 8°. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* 1907. m. 5.40.

Blaydes (H. M.) *Miscellanea critica.* (iv, 268 S.) 8°. Halle, *Buchh. eds Waisenhauses*, 1907. m. 5.

Brockelmann (C.) Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen. (In 2 Bdn.) 1. Bd.: Laut- u. Formenlehre. 1. Lfg. (S. 1-128.) 8°. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard*, 1907. Subskr.-Pr. m. 5.20.

Callimachi hymni et epigrammata. III. edidit Udalr. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. (68 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1907. m. 80.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. 40,5×29 cm. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. Vol. XIII, partis II fasc. II. Inscriptiones trium Galliarum et Germaniarum latinae, edd. Otto Hirschfeld et Carol. Zangemeister. Partis II fasc. II. Inscriptiones Germaniae inferioris ed. Alfr. Domaszewski. Milia Galliarum et Germaniarum edd. Th. Mommsen (†), O. Hirschfeld, A. Domaszewski. (S. 31-38 u. 505-713.) 1907. m. 23.

Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientium. Curantibus I.-B. Chabot, I. Guidi, H. Hyvernat, B. Carra de Vaux. Scriptores arabici. Series III. Tom. XVIII. Fasc. II. Textus. 8°. Parisiis. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. XVIII. Synaxarium Alexandrium. Tom. I. Fasc. II. Textus. Ed. I. Forget. (154 S.) 1906. m. 8.

Diogenis Oenoandensis fragmenta. Ordinavit et explicavit Johs. William. (xlvii, 105 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 2.80.

Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae. Edd. B. Keil et R. Reitzenstein. Vol. XII. 8°. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*. Fasc. III. Bloch (Robert). De Pseudo-Luciani amoribus. (75 S.) 1907. m. 2.40.

— philologicae Halenses. Vol. XVII. gr. 8°. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. Pars 2. Bertheau (Ioa.) De Platonis epistula septima. (iii u. S. 115-230.) 1907. m. 3.

Donati, Tiberi Claudii, interpretationes Vergilianae. Primum ad vetustissimorum codicum fidem recognitas ed. Henr. Georgii. Vol. II. Aeneidos libri VII-XII. (688 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 12.

Egidii Corboliensis viaticus de signis et symptomatibus aegritudinum. Nunc primum ed. Valent. Rose. (xxx, 125 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 3.20.

Hirzel (Rud.) Themis, Dike u. Verwandtes. (vi, 445 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*, 1907. m. 10.

Homeri carmina. Recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arth. Ludwich. Pars I. Ilias. Vol. II. (xii, 652 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 20.

Horatius Flaccus, des Q., Iamben- u. Sermonendichtung. Vollständig in heim. Versformen verdeutscht v. Karl Staedler. (viii, 206 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1907. m. 3.

— Sermonen. Deutsch v. C. Bardt. 3. verm. Aufl. (viii, 258 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1907. m. 4.

Horatii Romani Porcaria cum aliis eiusdem carminibus. Primum ed. ac praefatus est Max. Lehnerdt. (xvii, 78 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 1.60.

Imelmann (Rud.) Zeugnisse zur altenglischen Odoaker-Dichtung. (47 S. m. 1 Taf.) 8°. Berlin, *J. Springer*, 1907. m. 2.

Klassikertexte, Berliner. Hrsg. v. der Generalverwaltg. der königl. Museen zu Berlin. Lex. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 5. Heft. Dichterfragmente, griechische. 2. Hälfte. Lyrische u. dramat. Fragmente. Bearb. v. W. Schubart u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Mit 6 Lichtdr.-Taf. (ii, 160 S.) 1907. m. 11.

Lesbonactis Sophistae quae supersunt. ed. et commentariis instruxit Frider. Kiehr. (vii, 62 S. m. 1 Taf.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 2.

Lidzbarski (Mark). Altsemitische Texte. Hrsg. u. erklärt. (In 8 Heften.) 8°. Giessen, *A. Töpelmann*. 1. Heft. Kananäische Inschriften (Moabitisch, Althebräisch, Phönizisch, Punisch). Mit 8 Abbildgn. (64 S.) 1907. m. 2.

Literaturen, die, des Ostens in Einzeldarstellungen. gr. 8°. Leipzig, *C. F. Amelang*. VII. Bd. 2. Abtlg. Geschichte der christlichen Literaturen des Orients v. C. Brockelmann (syrisch u. christlich-arabisch), P. Frz. Nik. Finck (armenisch), P. Johs. Leipoldt (koptisch) u. Prof. Enno Littmann (äthiopisch). (viii, 281 S.) 1907. m. 5.

Lucianus ed. Nils Nilén. Prolegomena. (1. Heft.) (72 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 1.25.

— dasselbe. Vol. I. Fasc. I. Libelli I-XIV. (lxxv, 208 S.) 8°. Ebd. 1906. m. 3.20.

Patin (A.) Der Lucidus Ordo des Horatius. (48 S.) 8°. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*, 1907. m. 1.20.

Psalterium Bononiense. Interpretationem veterem slavica ed. V. Jagic. Accedunt XIX specimina codicum. (xii, 968 S.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1907. m. 25.

Rabenhorst (Max.) Der ältere Plinius als Epitomator des Verrius Flaccus. Eine Quellenanalyse des 7. Buches der Naturgeschichte. (vi, 132 S.) 8°. Berlin, *G. Reimer*, 1907. m. 3.

Reik (Karl). Der Optativ bei Polybius u. Philo v. Alexandria. (xii, 197 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock*, 1907. m. 3.50.

Schriftdenkmäler, vorderasiatische, der königl. Museen zu Berlin. Hrsg. v. der vorderasiat. Abteilg. 1. Heft. (xi, 96 S.) 36,5×26 cm. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*, 1907. m. 12.

Untersuchungen, philologische, hrsg. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 19. Heft. Friedländer (Paul). Herakles. Sagengeschichtliche Untersuchgn. (x, 185 S.) 1907. m. 6.

Vürtheim (J.) De Aiakis origine, cultu, patria. (v, 228 S.) 8°. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff*, 1907. m. 6.50.

Ziegler (Konr.) Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der vergleichenden Lebensbeschreibungen Plutarchs. (viii, 208 S. m. 1 Taf.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 6.

#### ITALIAN.

Manacorda. Della poesia latina in Germania durante il Rinascimento. Roma, 4°, p. 115. L. 9.

Pascal (C.) Seneca. Catania, 16°, p. 84. L. 1.50.

Sassani (Gioachino). Gli epigrammi di Archia di Antiochia. Catania, 8°, p. 91. L. 3.50.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Allen (Hamilton Ford). *The Infinitive in Polybius compared with the Infinitive in Biblical Greek.* Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1907. 50 cts. net; 53 cts. postpaid.

Appendix Vergiliana sive Carmina Minora Vergilio adtributa. *Recognovit et adnotatione critica instruxit R. Ellis.* Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1907.

Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi. Utgivet genom Axel Kock. XXIII. N. F. XIX, 4. Lund, *C. W. K. Gleerup*, 1907; Leipzig, *Harrassowitz*.

Arnoldt (Emil). *Gesammelte Schriften. Band I. In der Bahn freige-meindlicher Ansichten. Kritiken u. Referate.* Berlin, *Bruno Cassirer*, 1907.

Arnold (Robert F.) *Das Moderne Drama.* Strassburg, *Verlag von K. J. Trübner*, 1907. geh. 6 m.

ΑΘΗΝΑ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐπιστημονικῆς εταιρείας. Τόμος XIX, 1 καὶ 2. Ἀθήνησιν, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου, 1907.

Baldwin (J. Mark). *Thought and Language.* Reprinted from the *Psychological Review*. Vol. XIV, No. 3. May, 1907. Lancaster, Pa., *The Review Publishing Co.*

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur. Hsbg. von Wilhelm Braune. XXXII. Bd. 3. Heft. Halle a. S., *Max Niemeyer*, 1907.

Berliner Klassikertexte. Heft V. Zweite Hälfte. Griechische Dichterfragmente. Zweite Hälfte. Lyrische und Dramatische Fragmente. Bearbeitet von W. Schubart und U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 11 m.

Blass (Friedrich). *Die Eumeniden des Aischylos. Erklärende Ausgabe.* Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 5 m.

Bollettino di filologia classica. Diretto da Giacomo Cortese e Luigi Valmaggi. Anno XIII. N. 12. Torino, *Ermanno Loescher*, giugno, 1907.

British School at Athens, *The Annual of the.* No. XII. Session 1905-1906. London, *Macmillan & Co., Limited*.

Brugmann (Karl). *Die Distributiven und die Kollektiven Numeralia der Indogermanischen Sprachen.* Des 25. Bandes der Abh. d. phil.-hist. Klasse d. Königl. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss. No. 5. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. geh. 3 m. 60 pf.

Brugmann (Karl) u. Leskien (August). *Zur Kritik der künstlichen Welt-sprachen.* Strassburg, *Karl J. Trübner*, 1907. 80 pf.

David Binning Monro. *A short memoir.* Translated, with slight alterations, from a notice by J. Cook Wilson in the "Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft". Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1907. 2s. net.



Demosthenis Orationes. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit S. H. Butcher. Tom. II Pars I. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1907. Paper, 3s.; cl. 3s. 6d.

Dictionary of Surnames of the United Kingdom. By Henry Harrison. Part I. London, *The Eaton Press*, 1907. 1s. net.

Dillmann's Ethiopic Grammar. Second edition by Carl Bezold. Translated by James A. Crichton. London, *Williams & Norgate*, 1907. 25s. net.

Duckworth (H. T. F.) Notes on Alexander Pallis' Romaic Version of the New Testament Canticles. Cambridge, *W. Heffer & Sons*; London, *Simpkin, Marshall & Co.*, 1906. 1s. net.

Early English Lyrics. Chosen by E. K. Chambers and F. Sidgwick. London, *A. H. Bullen*, 1907.

Education in Matters of Sex. Chicago, *Chicago Society of Social Hygiene*, 1907. 25 cts.

Ellis (Robinson). The Elegiae in Maecenatem. A lecture delivered June 10, 1907. London, *Henry Frowde*, 1907. 1s. net.

Eschrich (Enrique Pérez). Fortuna and El Placer de no Hacer Nada. With Introduction, Notes, Vocabulary, and Exercises by Edward Gray. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1907. 50 cts.; postpaid 55 cts.

Euphorion. Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte. Herausg. v. Aug. Sauer. XIV. 1. Leipzig u. Wien, *Carl Fromme*, 1907. 4 m.

Euripide. Iphigénie en Tauride. Texte avec commentaire. Par Henri Weil. 3<sup>me</sup> édition revue. Paris, *Librairie Hachette et Cie.*, 1907.

Fulda (Ludwig). Das verlorene Paradies. Edited by Paul H. Grumann. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1907. 45 cts.

German American Annals. New Series, Vol. 5, No. 3. Old S. Vol. 9, No. 3. May and June, 1907. Philadelphia, *The German American Historical Society*.

Gibb (E. J. W.) Memorial Series. Vol. IV. Umayyads and 'Abbāsids. Being the fourth part of Jurji Zaydān's History of Islamic Civilization. Translated by D. S. Margoliouth. Leyden, *E. J. Brill*. London, *Luzac & Co.*, 1907.

— Vol. V. The Travels of Ibn Jubayr. Edited by William Wright. 2nd ed. revised by M. J. De Goeje. Leyden, *E. J. Brill*; London, *Luzac & Co.*, 1907.

Grierson (G. A.) Linguistic Survey of India. Vol. IV. Muṇḍā and Dravidian Languages. Calcutta, *Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, India*, 1906.

Hadsits (G. D.) The Lucretian Invocation of Venus. Reprinted from *Classical Philology* II 2. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1907.

Harry (J. E.) Problems in the Prometheus. University Studies published by the University of Cincinnati. Series II. Vol. III. No. 1. Cincinnati, *University Press, Burnet Woods*, 1907.

Haupt (Paul). Der achtundsechzigste Psalm.—Die semitischen Wurzeln QR, KR, XR.—Der assyrische Name des Potwals. Reprinted from the

American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures. Vol. XXIII, No. 5. April, 1907. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*.

Hermes. Hsgb. von Fr. Leo u. Carl Robert. 42. Bd. 2. u. 3. Hft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907.

Hirzel (Rudolf). Themis, Dike und Verwandtes. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*, 1907. 10 m.; geb. 11 m. 50 pf.

Horatius (Q. H. Flaccus) Die Sermonen des. Deutsch v. C. Bardt. 3. verm. Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 4 m.

Horaz' Iamben- u. Sermonen Dichtung. Vollst. in heimischen Versformen verdeutscht v. Karl Staedler. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 3 m.

Inglis (Alexander James) and Prettyman (Virgil). First Book in Latin. 2nd ed. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1907. 90 cts. net.

Jebb (Sir Richard). Essays and Addresses. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1907.

Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society. New Series. Vol. I. No. 1. Printed privately for the members of the Gypsy Lore Society, 6 Hope Place, Liverpool.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. XXVII. Part 1. 1907. London, *Macmillan & Co., Limited*.

Kelsey (Francis W.) The Position of Latin and Greek in American Education. Three papers. Reprinted from the Educational Review, New York, Dec., 1906, Jan. and Feb., 1907.

Klio. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte hsgb. von C. F. Lehmann-Haupt u. E. Kornemann. 7. Bd. Heft 2. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1907.

Krebs' Antibarbarus der Lateinischen Sprache. Siebente genau durchgesehene und vielfach umgearbeitete Auflage von J. H. Schmalz. 9te Lieferung. Basel, *Benno Schwabe*, 1907.

Kukula (R. C.) Alkman's Partheneion. Ein Beitrag zum lakonischen Artemiskulte. Sonderabdruck aus Philologus LXVI. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*.

Kultur der Gegenwart, Die. Hsgb. von P. Hinneberg. Teil I. Abt. 8. Die griech. u. lat. Literatur u. Sprache. Von U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, K. Krumbacher, J. Wackernagel, Fr. Leo, E. Norden, F. Skutsch. 2. Aufl. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. geb. 12 m.

Laurand (L.) Études sur le Style des Discours de Cicéron. Paris, *Librairie Hachette et Cie.*, 1907.

— De M. Tulli Ciceronis Studiis Rhetoricis. Paris, *Librairie Alphonse Picard & Fils*, 1907.

Leicarragan Verb, The. An Analysis of the 703 Verbal Forms in the Gospel according to Matthew. By E. S. Dodgson. Oxford, *University Press*, 1907. 15s. net.

Lessing's Minna von Barnhelm. Ed. with Introduction, German Questions, Notes, and Vocabulary by Philip Schuyler Allen. New York, *Charles E. Merrill Co.*, 1907.

Leutner (Winfred George). The Article in Theocritus. J. H. U. Diss. Baltimore, *J. H. Furst Co.*, 1907.

Lindsay (W. M.) Syntax of Plautus. St. Andrews University Publications, No. IV. Oxford, *James Parker & Co.*, 1907.

Manilii (M.) Astronomica. Edidit Theodorus Breiter, I. Carmina. Lipsiae, *Sumptibus Dieterichii*, 1907. geh. 3 m. 80 pf.

Maryland Geological Survey (William Bullock Clark, State Geologist). The Physical Features of Maryland. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, May, 1906.

— Pliocene and Pleistocene. Ditto, 1906.

— St. Mary's County. Ditto, 1907.

— St. Mary's County Atlas. Ditto.

— Calvert County. Ditto.

— Calvert County Atlas. Ditto.

McKinlay (Arthur Patch). Stylistic Tests and The Chronology of the Works of Boethius. Printed from the Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. xviii, 1907.

Μελέτη ('H). Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα ἐν' Ἀθήναις. Τεύχος 3ον, 4ον, 5ον. ἐν' Ἀθήναις, 1907. @ 1 δραχμή.

Mérimée (Prosper). Carmen and Other Stories ed. with notes and vocabulary by Edward Manley. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1907.

Modern Language Notes. Managing Editor: A. Marshall Elliott. Vol. XXII, No. 6. Baltimore, June, 1907.

Mommsen (Theodor). Gesammelte Schriften. III. Bd. Juristische Schriften. III. Bd. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 15 m.

Mood (James Raider). Some Figurative Usages of *Venire* and *Ire*. J. H. U. Diss. Baltimore, *J. H. Furst Co.*, 1907.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. Johannes Ilberg u. Bernhard Gerth. Zehnter Jahrg. XIX. u. XX. Bandes 4., 5. u. 6. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Hsbg. vom Neuphilologischen Verein in Helsingfors. Nr. 3/4, 1907. Redaktion: *Dr. H. Suolahti*, Peterstr. 5.

Oliver (Edmund Henry). Roman Economic Conditions to the Close of the Republic. University of Toronto Studies, History and Economics. Toronto, *University of Toronto Library*, 1907.

Open Court, The. Editor: Dr. Paul Carus. Vol. XXI, No. 6. Chicago, *The Open Court Publishing Co.*, June, 1907.

Oxford English Dictionary, The. A New English Dictionary, edited by James A. H. Murray. MISBODE-MONOPOLY. By Henry Bradley. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1907. Double Section, 5s. (\$1.25).

Papyrus Grecs. Publiés sous la direction de Pierre Jouguet. Tome 1, Fascicule 1. Paris, *Ernest Leroux*, 1907.

Pascal (Carlo). Poesia Latina Medievale. Saggi e note critiche. Catania, *Libreria editrice Concetto Battiato di Francesco Battiato*, 1907.

Peterson (W.) Transposition Variants in Cicero's Verrines. Reprinted from *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2.

Phönikische Sprachlehre u. Epigraphik. Für das Selbststudium leichtfasslich u. übersichtlich dargestellt v. J. Rosenberg. Wien u. Leipzig, *A. Hartleben*, 1907.

Platonis Opera. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Ioannes Burnet. Tomus V. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1907. Pap. 7s.; cl. 8s.; India pap. 10s. 6d.

Raney (M. L.) Some ANA of the Marburg Collection. From the *Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin*, Vol. XVIII, No. 193. April, 1907.

Rankin (Edwin Moore). The Rôle of the ΜΑΤΕΙΡΟΙ in the Life of the Ancient Greeks. Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1907.

Reik (Karl). Der Optativ bei Polybios und Philo von Alexandria. Leipzig, *Buchhandlung Gustav Fock, G. m. b. H.*, 1907.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Mayo de 1907. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. IV. Num. 2 y 3. Habana, *Imprenta "Avisador Comercial"*, 1907.

Richards (Herbert). Notes on Xenophon and Others. London, *E. Grant Richards*, 1907. 6s. net.

Rotrou (Jean). Saint Genest and Venceslas. Edited w. Introduction and Notes by Thomas Frederick Crane. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1907.

Skeat (W. W.) The Proverbs of Alfred. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1907. 2s. 6d.

Slijper (Ezechiël). De Formularum Andecavensium Latinitate Disputatio. Amstelodami, *H. Eisendrath*, 1906.

Society of Biblical Archaeology. Proceedings, Vol. XXIX. Parts 4 and 5. May and June, 1907. London, *At the Offices of the Society*.

Sophocles. Erkl. v. F. W. Schneidewin u. A. Nauck. 10. Aufl. besorgt von Ludwig Radermacher (Haupt u. Sauppesche Sammlung). Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 1 m. 80 pf.

Southwest Society of the Archaeological Institute of America. The Southwest Museum. Three Years of Success. Third Bulletin. Los Angeles, Cal., May 1, 1907.

Steyns (D.) Étude sur les Métaphores et les Comparaisons dans les oeuvres en prose de Sénèque le Philosophe. Gand, *E. Van Goethem*, 1907.

Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. Hsgb. von E. Drerup, H. Grimme, u. J. P. Kirsch. 1. Bd. 2. Heft. Der Senat unter Augustus von Theodor Anton Abele. Paderborn, *Ferdinand Schöningh*, 1907.

Σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν ὠφελίμων βιβλίων. 85. Δ. Κακαμάνον. Ἡ Ζωγραφική. 86. Γ. Δρωσίνη. Ὁ Κυνηγός. ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1907.

Tebtunis Papyri, The. Part II. Edited by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt with the assistance of E. J. Goodspeed. University of California Publications, Graeco-Roman Archaeology, Vol. II. London and New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1907.

Vahlen (Iohannes). *Opuscula academica. Pars I.* Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. geh. 12 m.

Vergils Gedichte. Erklärt von Th. Ladewig und C. Schaper. 1 Bändchen: *Bukolika und Georgika*. 8. Aufl. bearb. von Paul Deuticke. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 3 m.

Wageningen (Jacobus van). *Album Terentianum*. 6 m. *Scaenica Romana*. Groningen, 1907. 1 m. 70 pf.

Warren (F. M.) *Some Features of Style in Early French Narrative Poetry (1150-70)*. Reprinted from *Modern Philology*. Vol. II, Nos. 2 and 3 and Vol. IV, No. 4. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1905-6-7.

Wellcome's Photographic Exposure Record and Diary, 1907. New York, *Burroughs, Wellcome & Co.*, 45 Lafayette St.

*Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen*. Hsgb. von H. J. Müller. LXI. Jahrg. Der neuen Folge 41. Jahrg. 3 Hefte: Mai, Juni, Juli. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907.

*Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum und Deutsche Litteratur*. Hsgb. von Edward Schroeder und Gustav Roethe. 49. Bd. 1. Hft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907.

*Zeitschrift für französische Sprache u. Litteratur*. Hsgb. von D. Behrens. Band XXXI, Heft 5 u. 7. Der Abhandlungen 3. u. 4. Heft. Chemnitz u. Leipzig, *Verlag von Wilhelm Gronau*, 1907.